National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XV. NO. 11. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 5, 1854. WHOLE NO. 739.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY (ON SATURDAY),
At $2 per annum,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, 142 Nassau St., New York,
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
31 North Fifth St., Philadelphia.

THE STANDARD.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE ACT UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

Decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin.

JUSTICE SMITH'S OPINION CONFIRMED.

MADISON, JULY 19, 1854.

Stephen V. R. Ableman, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Wisconsin, ex rel. S. M. Booth, defendant in error.

Chief Justice EDWARD V. VINTON delivered the opinion of the Court, as follows:

The questions presented by this record are of great importance. A citizen of this State presented a petition to a Justice of this Court, setting forth that he was unlawfully deprived of his liberty, and stating that a writ of *habeas corpus* might be issued to bring him before the said Justice, together with the cause of his imprisonment, in order that he might be liberated, if, upon investigation, it should be ascertained that his confinement was illegal. The writ was issued and served, and the prisoner brought before the officer; and such proceedings were there had that the prisoner was discharged. A writ of *certiorari* was issued to bring the record of these proceedings before this Court, in order to correct any error that might have been committed.

The first question which presents itself is whether the writ of *certiorari* can properly issue from this Court in a case like the present. It is contended by the relator (Booth) that the writ ought not to have been issued, because we have no power to remand the relator back again to the custody from which he was discharged. But this, if true, would, as the matter appears to us, constitute no objection to our jurisdiction.

It would only show that if we should be of opinion that the relator was improperly discharged, we should not have the power to give entire relief in the premises; but a simple reversal of the order of discharge, by this Court, without remanding the prisoner, would enable the person from whose custody the relator was discharged to retake his prisoner. The Constitution of this State (Art. 7, Sec. 3) gives this Court power to issue writs of "habeas corpus, mandamus, quo warranto, certiorari, and other original and remedial writs, and to hear and determine the same." We held in the case of the Attorney-General vs. Blossom (1st Wis. R. 317) that this power was not granted to the Supreme Court merely to enable it to enforce the jurisdiction conferred upon it in other parts of the Constitution, but, on the contrary, that this clause of the Constitution contained a grant of power to the Court. It follows that this Court has the power to issue any of the writs enumerated, in any case proper for their issue, and to hear and determine them.

It will hardly be contended that this is not a proper case for the exercise of this power. A judicial decision has been had, by force of which a person has been discharged from imprisonment, and those who have an interest in having the imprisonment continued, as public officers or otherwise, and from whose custody he was discharged, have a right to the proper writ or process to bring the case before this Court for revision. And the writ of certiorari is the proper one for that purpose. We, therefore, think that the objection of the relator is untenable.

The next question presented is whether a Justice of this Court has the power to issue, in vacation, a writ of *habeas corpus*, and make it returnable before himself at Chambers. It is contended by the plaintiff in error (Ableman) that as this power is given by the Statute (Rev. Stat. chap. 124, sec. 3) to "*Judges* of the Supreme Court, Circuit or County Courts" only, a *Justice* of this Court has no power to issue the writ. The reason given to sustain this position is that, at the time the act conferring this power was passed, there were no *Justices* of the Supreme Court; that the Constitution of the State provided for the election of Circuit Judges, and that, by force of the Constitution, they were to be Judges of the Supreme Court for five years, and afterward until the Legislature should otherwise provide.

It is urged further, in support of this position, that the provision in the Constitution providing for the organization of a separate Supreme Court, after the expiration of five years (if the Legislature should see fit to establish one), and the organization of the present Court by virtue of this provision, show that the Justices of the Court should do no act which can come before the court for review; it being the intention of the framers of the Constitution, and of the Legislature which passed the act regulating the manner in which the writ of *habeas corpus* is to be issued, that the present Court should not sit in review upon any decisions made by one of its members; thus avoiding what was thought to be an evil, while the Supreme Court was composed of the circuit judges.

We do not think this objection well taken. The act to provide for the organization of this Court (Sess. Laws, 1852, chap. 395, sec. 4) expressly declares that the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court shall be subject to all the duties and liabilities to which the Judges of the former Supreme Court were subject. Among those duties was that of granting writs of *habeas corpus*, when applied for in a proper case, and we think that we should be guilty of a gross violation of duty were we to refuse them merely because the case might be reviewed before the whole Court. The Legislature have a right to impose any duty upon us as a Court, or upon the Justices who compose the Court, which is not incompatible with the consitution, and we do not think that the term, separate Supreme Court, which is applied to this Court, necessarily implies that the Justices of the Court cannot be empowered by the Legislature to do an act which may come before the whole Court.

The next question is whether the writ ought to have been issued, it appearing from the petition of the relator that he was imprisoned by colour of legal process issued by a Commissioner of the United States for the District of Wisconsin. It is insisted by the counsel for the plaintiff in error that in all cases the general comity of Courts which have concurrent jurisdiction leaves the case to the Court whose jurisdiction first attaches, and that such jurisdiction cannot be taken from the Court by subsequent proceedings in any other Court of concurrent jurisdiction. It is further insisted that this rule applies on higher grounds in Courts of the distinct jurisdiction of the States and the United States, and that the process and proceedings of Commissioners form no exception to this rule, as they are officers of the Courts, and recognised as part of the judicial organization of the United States. We do not see how the Commissioners can properly be called officers of the Courts of the United States. It is true that they are appointed by the Judges of those Courts, but neither the Courts nor the Judges are responsible for their acts. On the contrary, their duty and power are prescribed with particularity in the acts of Congress. The Courts have no power to direct them as to the mode in which the duties imposed upon them by law shall be performed, and it seems to us to be a great misuse of language to call them officers of the Courts. Nor do we think that they can, with any propriety, be called judicial officers. The Constitution of the United States (Art. 3, Sec. 1) provides that "the judicial power of the United shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the superior and inferior Courts, shall hold their office during good behaviour, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office." In the case of Martin vs. Hunter's Lessee (1st Wheaton, R. 305), the Supreme Court of the United States says (after quoting this section of the Constitution), "Could Congress create or limit any other tenure of the judicial office? Could they refuse to pay, at stated times, the stipulated salary, or diminish it during the continuance in office. But one answer can be given to those questions; it must be in the negative." And again, in the same case: "Congress cannot vest any portion of the judicial power of the United States, except in the Courts ordained and established by itself." We, therefore, do not see how these Commissioners can be regarded as a part of the judicial organization of the United States. But the position assumed by the counsel for the plaintiff in error, that the Court whose jurisdiction first attaches to a case will retain it, notwithstanding that proceedings may be subsequently commenced in other Courts of concurrent jurisdiction, is, we think, indisputably correct. It is a familiar principle, and will be denied by no one. But the question arises, whether the facts stated in the petition of the relator for the writ of *habeas corpus* show such a case.

It will not be denied that the citizens of the State naturally and properly look to their own State tribunals for relief from all kinds of illegal restraint and imprisonment. These States are clothed with power sufficient for their protection, and would be recreant to their duty were they to refuse to exercise it upon all proper occasions. We do not think the principle contended for by the plaintiff in error applies to a case of this nature.

The petitioner stated, in his petition for a writ, that he was restrained of his liberty by reason of a pretended warrant, a copy of which is annexed to the petition. By that it appears that Winfield Smith, acting as a Commissioner of the United States, had, upon an examination of the petitioner for an alleged offence against the laws of the United States, ordered the petitioner to recognise with sufficient sureties in the sum of two thousand dollars for his appearance at a term of the District Court to be held at Madison on the first Monday of July then next, and that, in default of the recognisance, the Marshal was commanded to deliver petitioner to the common jail, &c. The warrant recites that the petitioner had been charged on oath "with having, on the eleventh day of March, eighteen hundred and fifty-four, at the city of Milwaukee, in said County and District, unlawfully aided, assisted and abetted a person named Joshua Glover, held to service or labour in the State of Missouri, under the law thereof, and being the property of one Benammi S. Garland, and having escaped therefrom into the State of Wisconsin, to escape from the lawful custody of Charles C. Cotton, a deputy of the Marshal of the United States for the District of Wisconsin, the said Charles C. Cotton having then and there arrested and taken into custody the said Joshua Glover, by virtue of a warrant issued by the Judge of the United States for said district, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress in that case made and provided, approved September 18, 1850."

In order to show that the case is within the principle in question, it must appear that the District Court of the United States had the case pending before it which was made by the issuing and service of the *habeas corpus*; that the question of the imprisonment of the petitioner was then pending before that court, and this the facts of the case do not show. They merely show the ordinary case of a person imprisoned under colour of legal process for an alleged offence. In such a case, the investigation of the legality of his imprisonment does not necessarily involve an inquiry into the question of the guilt or innocence of the prisoner, nor of his liability to be held to answer for the alleged offence.

Thus, if the imprisonment is by virtue of a warrant issued by a State magistrate, any officer in the State, authorized to issue the writ of *habeas corpus*, may examine into the cause of the imprisonment, and may discharge the prisoner upon his giving bail for his appearance at the proper Court to answer for the offence with which he is charged, if bail has been required by the magistrate, and the officer who issues the writ of *habeas corpus* should be of opinion that the offence was bailable. So if the magistrate has no authority to imprison. So if the warrant of commitment should set forth no offence, and the commitment should be, for that reason, irregular, unless proof should be offered with the return of the writ, to show that the prisoner was guilty of no offence (*Revised Statutes*, ch. 124, sec. 21). In these cases, and many more which might be put, the question of the legality of the imprisonment is investigated, without ousting a Court of any jurisdiction which it has acquired. Nor do we think that the question is changed by the fact that the officer who issued the warrant by virtue of which the petitioner was imprisoned was an officer of the United States. In many cases the State Courts and United States Courts have concurrent jurisdiction. In some the jurisdiction of the State Courts is exclusive. And in some, that of the United States Courts is exclusive. When the jurisdiction is concurrent, the Court whose jurisdiction first attaches will retain the case, and the other Courts will not interfere, as in no other way can a conflict between the different Courts be prevented, and, of course, when a Court has exclusive jurisdiction, no other Court can take jurisdiction.

But if the conclusions we have arrived at are correct, the jurisdiction of no Court is disturbed by issuing a writ of *habeas corpus*, and discharging a prisoner who has been committed by an inferior magistrate for refusing to procure bail for his appearance at some Court to answer for an alleged offence, or when bail has been refused and the prisoner is held in custody.

In Sims's case (7th Cush. R.), the Supreme Court of Massachusetts saw no objection, on this account, to issuing a writ of *habeas corpus* to bring before the Court a prisoner in the custody of a Marshal of the United States under a warrant issued by a Commissioner of the United States, though the Court refused the writ for other reasons (see also 7th Cowan's R. 471; 10 Johnson R. 328).

It was insisted by the counsel for the plaintiff in error that our statutes (Rev. Stat. chap. 124, sec. 21) interposed an insurmountable objection to the jurisdiction of a State officer, in a case like the present, because it provides that the officer shall, although the commitment be irregular, remand the prisoner to custody, or hold him to bail, if it appears from testimony offered with the return that he has been guilty of an offence. In such a case, it is insisted that the officer acts as an examining Magistrate, an office whose duties he cannot discharge, if the offence proved is one of which the United States Courts have exclusive jurisdiction. But we think that, whatever difficulties this section of the statutes may create as to the proposed course to be pursued by the officer, in a case of that description, IT SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED SO AS TO DEPRIVE A STATE COURT, OR OFFICER, OF THE POWER TO ISSUE THE WRIT IN ALL CASES WHERE A CITIZEN OF THIS STATE IS HELD IN CUSTODY ON THE GROUND OF AN ALLEGED VIOLATION OF A LAW OF THE UNITED STATES. The same difficulty would present itself if a State Magistrate, acting wholly without authority, should commit a person to prison for refusing to give bail for his appearance at a Court of the United States, to answer to an offence against the laws of the United States.

There being no valid objection to issuing the writ and bringing the prisoner before the officer, the question arises whether the discharge of the prisoner was in accordance with law. The return of the Marshal to the writ of *habeas corpus* sets out substantially the same reason for the detention of the prisoner as that stated in the petition for the writ above given, so that there is no necessity for restating it. The first objection taken to the return is, that it does not set forth a valid reason. Upon this subject we fully concur in the opinion of the Justice of this Court who discharged the prisoner. The warrant fails to state any offence under the act of Congress in question, inasmuch as it does not show for what purpose Joshua Glover, therein named, was in the custody of the Deputy of the Marshal. He may have been in custody pursuant to the act of Congress, approved September 18, 1850, and not have been arrested as a fugitive from labour. The warrant does not therefore state that the petitioner aided, abetted, or assisted a person who was arrested as a fugitive from labour to escape from custody. This is essential, in order to constitute an offence against the act of Congress. We are aware that it is sufficient in a warrant to state the offence without that particularity required in an indictment; but still there must be, at least, a general statement of the offence, in order to justify the arrest.

It is further objected to the return of the Marshal that, admitting Glover to have been arrested as a fugitive from labour, under the act of Congress, approved September 18, 1850, still his arrest was unlawful for the reason that the act is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and therefore void. And it is contended by the relator that it can be no crime to abet or assist a person to escape from illegal punishment. The principal reasons urged in favour of this position of the relator are, that the Constitution of the United States confers no power upon Congress to legislate upon the subject of the surrender of fugitives from labour—that the act in question attempts to confer judicial power upon Commissioners, not upon Courts; and that by virtue of the act a person may be deprived of his liberty "without due process of law."

On the other hand, it is contended by the plaintiff in error that these questions are not now open for discussion, as they have all been settled by the Supreme Court of the United States; and as that Court is the only one which can, which has the power to settle finally the question of the constitutionality of an act of Congress, all other Courts, are bound to acquiesce in their decision. It is not, of course, claimed by the plaintiff in error that the act of Congress in question has been before that Court for consideration, but it is contended that an act passed by Congress, Feb. 12, 1793 (1st U. S. Stat. at large, 302), contains provisions not distinguishable in principle from those of the act of Sept. 18, 1850, and that the Court has decided this act to be valid and obligatory. We do not understand that the two acts are in all respects alike in principle, or even similar. The act of 1793 provides for the surrender of fugitives from labour, and so far as it relates to the latter description of persons, it is similar to the act of 1850. But the two acts differ essentially in the manner in which the surrender is to be effected. By the former, the person to whom the service or labour was due was authorized to seize or arrest the fugitive, and to take him before any Judge of the Circuit or District Court of the United States, residing or being within the State, or before any magistrate of a county, city or town corporate, wherein such seizure or arrest was made, and upon proof to the satisfaction of such judge or magistrate, either by oral testimony or affidavit taken and certified by a magistrate of any such State or Territory, that the person so seized owed service or labour under the laws of the State to the claimant, it became the duty of the judge or magistrate to give a certificate thereof to the claimant, his agent or attorney, which was sufficient warrant for the removal of the fugitive to the State or Territory from which he escaped. It will be observed that the alleged fugitive was to be taken before some judge of the Circuit or District Court of the United States, or before some State magistrate, who decided upon the question of the surrender of the fugitive to the claimant, upon proof to be submitted to him. He had the power to weigh the testimony and to decide upon its sufficiency. The act of September 18, 1850, differs from that of 1793 in two essential particulars. By the former, certain officers, called Commissioners, are authorized to make the surrender and give the certificate, and the testimony to show the fact that the alleged fugitive owes service or labour, and that he has escaped, is not to be weighed by the Commissioner, but has an effect given to it by the act independent entirely of the opinion of the Commissioner in regard to its sufficiency. The 10th section of the act provides that when any persons held to service or labour, in any State or Territory in the District of Columbia, shall escape therefrom, the party to whom such labour or service shall be due, or his agent or attorney, may apply to any court of record therein, or judge thereof in vacation, and make satisfactory proof to such court, or judge in vacation, of the escape aforesaid, and that the person escaping owed service or labour to such party. Whereupon the court shall cause a record to be made of the matter so proved, and also a general description of the person so escaping, with such convenient certainty as may be; and a transcript of such record authenticated by the attestation of the clerk and of the seal of said court, being produced in any other State, Territory or District, in which the person so escaping may be found, and being exhibited to any Judge, Commissioner, or other officer, authorized by the law of the United States to cause persons escaping from service or labour to be delivered up, shall be held and taken to be full and conclusive evidence of the fact of escape, and that the service or labour of the person escaping is due to the party in such record mentioned.

It can hardly be claimed, we think, that any adjudication upon the act of 1793 could decide all the questions involved in the act of 1850. But we will examine the cases referred to by the counsel for the plaintiff in error, upon this point. The act of 1793 received a very elaborate examination in the case of Prigg vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (16th Peters, R. 640.) The question, however, involved in the record before the Court was simply whether Prigg, the Plaintiff, had the right to seize, without process, in the State of Pennsylvania, Margaret Morgan, a fugitive slave, and remand her to the State of Maryland, from which she had escaped, contrary to the statute of the former State. The decision of the Court was, that he had the power, and the Court reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, which had affirmed the judgment of the Court in which Prigg was convicted. The principal question discussed by the Justices of the Court who gave opinions was, the power of Congress to legislate upon the subject of the reclamation of fugitives from labour, and they were all of opinion that Congress had the power; a majority holding that the power was exclusive, and that the State could not pass laws even in aid of the legislation of Congress. In the course of this discussion, nothing was said in relation to the powers of Commissioners, for those officers did not exist at the time when the act of Congress was passed, nor of the right of the alleged fugitive to a trial by Jury, to decide the question of fact upon which his surrender depends. In the case of Jones vs. Van Zandt (5th How. R. 215), the act of 1793 came again before the Court for its consideration, and in the course of the opinion given in that case, the Court says: "This Court has already, after much deliberation, decided that the act of Feb. 12, 1793, was not repugnant to the Constitution. The reasons for their opinion are fully explained by Justice Story, in Prigg vs. Penn., 16 Peters 611." In the case of Moore vs. Illinois (14th How. R. 13), the court states what was decided in the case of Prigg vs. Pennsylvania, and among the questions said to be decided in that case was this: "That the government is clothed with appropriate authority and functions to enforce the delivery [of fugitive slaves] on claim of the owner, and has properly exercised it in the act of Congress of 12th February, 1793." These are all the cases which we have been able to find where the act of 1793 has come before the Supreme Court of the United States for review, and in none of them is the question of the power of Commissioners to give the certificate to the claimant which authorizes the removal of the fugitive discussed or decided.

These cases are equally silent upon the question (a most important one) raised in this case as to the right of a person claimed as a fugitive from labour to have the facts which must be proved before he can be surrendered to the claimant tried and decided by a Jury. It is true that the act of 1793 provides for the surrender of the person claimed as a fugitive without such a trial and decision, and it is said in substance by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Jones vs. Van Zandt, and Moore vs. Illinois, that the Court did decide in the case of Prigg vs. Penna., that the act of Feb. 12, 1793, was constitutional. But upon looking at that case, we find that the question of a trial by jury to determine the facts of the case was not raised by the record, and was not discussed by the Court in giving its opinion. We think it would be most unjust to that Court to hold that it has decided questions which its Judges have not even discussed, and which have not been before it for adjudication.

We are of opinion, therefore, that, whatever may be the duty of this Court in relation to the question of the power of Congress to provide by law for the surrender of fugitives from labour to the person to whom their labour is due, we are not at liberty to consider the question of the right of a person claimed as a fugitive to a trial by jury before he can be surrendered or delivered up to the claimant, as already settled by the Court which has the power finally to decide all questions growing out of an alleged violation of the Constitution of the United States, by an act of Congress. We must consider the question as an open one.

It becomes, therefore, our duty to decide whether two of the act of Congress of September 18, 1850, as provides that certain officers, called commissioners, shall decide the questions of fact, which must be proved before the surrender of the alleged fugitive can take place, is valid and and obligatory. We think that we are also called upon to decide whether the proceedings provided for in the act for establishing judicially the fact of the escape of the alleged fugitive, and the fact that he owes service or labour, are in conformity with the Constitution of the United States. These questions are most grave and important; we would that we could avoid them, but they are forced upon us, and we are not at liberty to refuse to consider them.

We are of opinion that so much of the act of Congress in question as refers to the Commissioners for decision the questions of fact which are to be established by evidence before the alleged fugitive can be delivered up to the claimant, is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and therefore void, for two reasons—1st, because it attempts to confer upon those officers judicial powers; and, 2d, because it is a denial of the right of the alleged fugitive to have those questions tried and decided by a Jury, which, we think, is given him by the Constitution of the United States. We have referred to the case of Martin vs. Hunter's Lessees (1 Wheaton, p. 305), and to Art. 3, Sec. 1, of the Constitution of the United States, to show that Congress cannot vest any judicial power, under the Constitution, except in Courts. We are aware that Congress has established Courts in the various territories, and has provided for the appointment of Judges with a different tenure of office from that fixed by the Constitution; but the power to appoint these Judges is supposed to be derived from Art. 4, Sec. 2, of the Constitution, which provides that "Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property of the United States."

But however this may be, we are not aware that the authority to vest any portion of the judicial power in any tribunals created by itself, except those mentioned in section 1 of art. 3 of the Constitution, is claimed for Congress by any one, save in the single instance of judicial officers for the Territories belonging to the United States and for the District of Columbia. We think that the duties performed by the Commissioners, under the act in question, are judicial in their character; as clearly so as those performed by a Judge in the ordinary administration of justice. He is obliged to decide upon the questions presented judicially, and to give a certificate to the person claiming the alleged fugitive, which authorizes his transportation to the State from whence he is alleged to have escaped, or withhold it, as he shall think proper, in view of the evidence submitted for his consideration. It is true that the act, by providing that the record made in the State from whence the alleged fugitive may have escaped shall be conclusive evidence of the escape, and of the fact that the person claimed owes service or labour to the claimant, materially lessens the labour of the Commissioner, but this does not alter the nature of the act which he performs; it must be regarded as a judicial determination of the matter submitted to him. We are, therefore, of opinion, that the act under consideration, by attempting to vest judicial power in officers created by Congress and unknown to the Constitution, is repugnant to that instrument, and for that reason void.

And we think it equally clear that the Constitution is violated by withholding from the person claimed the right to a trial by jury, before he can be delivered up to the claimant.

The fifth article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States provides, among other things, that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Chancellor Kent, in his commentaries (Kent com, 3), says, "it may be received as a self-evident proposition, universally understood and acknowledged throughout this country, that no person can be taken or imprisoned, or disseized of his freehold, or liberties, or estate, or exiled, or condemned, or deprived of life, liberty, or property, unless by the law of the land, or the judgment of his peers."

"The words (*law of the land*) as used in *Magna Charta* in reference to this subject, are understood to mean due proces of law; this is, by indictment, or presentment of good and lawful men; and this, says Lord Coke, is the true sense and exposition of these words." We are aware that it has been said that slaves are not persons in the sense in which that term is used in the amendment to the Constitution above referred to. But this, admitting it to be true, does not affect the question under consideration, as persons who are free are liable to be arrested and deprived of their liberty by virtue of this act, without having had a trial by a jury of their peers. We do not propose to discuss the question whether a slave escaping from the State where he is held to service or labour, into a State where slavery does not exist, thereby becomes free by virtue of the local law, subject only to be delivered up, to be returned again to servitude, as it is a question not necessarily involved in the consideration of the subject before us. But we propose to examine the operation of the act upon a free citizen of a free State, and to show that by it such a person may be deprived of his liberty "without due process of law." It will be observed that the claimant can go before any court of record, or any judge thereof, in vacation, and make satisfactory proof to such Court or Judge, in vacation, of the escape, and that the person escaping owes service or labour to such party.

It then becomes the duty of the Court to cause a record to be made of the matters so proved, and also a description of the person escaping, and such record, being exhibited to any judge, commissioner or other officer authorized by law to cause persons escaping from service or labour to be delivered up, shall be held and taken to be conclusive evidence of the fact of escape, and that the service or labour of the person escaping is due to the party in such record mentioned. This testimony is taken and this record is made in the absence of the person to be affected by the proceeding; he has no opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses who depose to the facts which are thus conclusively proved; but without his knowledge evidence is manufactured, which, by virtue of this act, proves beyond question that he is a slave, and that he has escaped from servitude. We are at a loss to perceive how this proceeding, by virtue of which a freeman becomes a slave, can be justly called "due process of law," in the sense in which that language is used in the Constitution. We are aware that it has been said that the proceedings before the Commissioner do not determine the question of freedom or slavery, that the fugitive is only sent back to the State from which he is alleged to have escaped, and that when he reaches there he is a freeman or a slave, as his *status* shall be determined by the local law. It is further said that these proceedings are analogous to those by which the fugitive from justice is delivered up, to be taken to the State from which he has escaped; that a person may be arrested by virtue merely of indictment, founded on an affidavit made before a magistrate, charging him with treason, felony, or other crime, committed in some other State, and that upon the production of a copy of the indictment or affidavit, certified as authentic by the governor or chief magistrate of the State or Territory from which he fled, he shall be delivered up to be taken back. It is said that as this proceeding does not deprive the person of his liberty in the sense in which that term is used in the Constitution, but merely delivers him up, to be taken to the State where, according to the indictment or affidavit, the offence was committed, to be dealt with according to the local law, so neither do those proceedings accomplish more than the mere transfer of the alleged fugitive to the State where, as is claimed, he owes service or labour by force of the local law. We think this is a mistaken view of the question. The fugitive from justice is delivered to an agent appointed by the Governor of the State where the offence is alleged to have been committed, without any adjudication upon the question of his guilt or innocence; in other words, he is delivered to the officer of the law, and is in the custody of the law, for the purpose of being taken to the State where alone he can be tried for the alleged offence. But the case is very different with the alleged fugitive from labour. There is an adjudication before the Commissioner that he owes service or labour, and that he has escaped. By force of the act of Congress under consideration, the record made in the State from which he is said to have escaped is conclusive evidence that his status is that of a slave.

The Commissioner is obliged, if his identity is proved, so to adjudge, and the certificate which is given to the claimant is given because the Commissioner has so adjudged. Moreover, the Commissioner can only give the certificate to the claimant who must be the person to whom the labour or service is due, his agent or attorney, and it is given to him for that reason. It is not material to inquire what the condition of the person will be when he has been taken to the State where the labour or service is said to be due. He may regain his freedom, but if he does, it will be by force of the law of the State, and not by virtue of the act of Congress under consideration; for under that he has been adjudged a slave, and by force of it he has been taken as a slave by the person adjudged to be his owner, his agent or attorney, from the State where he was arrested to the State from which he is alleged to have escaped. We are therefore obliged to conclude that the alleged fugitive from labour is taken back to the State from which he is said to have escaped, not as a person merely charged with being a slave, but as a person who has been proved and adjudged to be a slave, and, as we believe, without due process of law—without having his rights passed upon and determined by a jury of his peers. We think it essential that his rights should be maintained by all courts and all tribunals, and for the reasons above given we must affirm the order made in this case, discharging the relator.

SLAVERY AND ITS FRUITS.

MURDER OF A SLAVE.—We learn from the Darlington (S. C.) *Flag* that the body of a slave, supposed to have been murdered, has been found in that district, and that an inquest was held and a verdict rendered, imputing the act to a young gentleman of the highest respectability, whose uniform gentleness of deportment and amiable character are utterly irreconcilable with the commission of such a deed in a normal state of mind. We understand that it is not probable that any further judicial inquiry, at the instance of the State, will be practicable. The reason why no further investigation is practicable would seem to be the absence of any witness competent to give testimony in the courts of the State.

OUTRAGES BY SLAVES.—We have been informed of several outrages attempted to be committed recently by negroes in the upper section of the first district, which calls loudly for vigilance on the part of the police. A few nights ago, a lady, living on Prytania street, was startled from her slumbers by a noise in her bed room. On getting up to ascertain the cause, she discovered a negro in her room. Her screams soon drew to her assistance a male relative, who slept in the adjoining room, who attempted to arrest the intruder. The negro, being a powerful athletic fellow, soon put his opponent *hors du combat*, and succeeded in making his escape over the balcony of the dwelling.

The most daring outrage of the kind, however, which has recently been brought to our notice, was attempted yesterday morning, a few minutes after 4 o'clock, on Felicity Road, in the vicinity of the horse station. A married lady, living in the fourth district, had been spending the previous night with her sister in the first district, in attending to a sick child of the latter. On going home, she was overtaken by a negro at the place above specified, who threw her down on the sidewalk. Her screams brought to her aid a gentleman living opposite to where the hellish deed was about to be committed, which caused the monster to desist and secure his own safety in flight.—*N. O. True Delta, July* 18.

FOURTH OF JULY IN GEORGIA.—A correspondent of the *Tribune* writes from Columbus, GA., under date of July 3, as follows:

"You anti-Nebraska men seem to think that you'll kill the Fourth of July dead by not celebrating it in Rhode Island; but we intend to keep it up here. I am going down, to-morrow, to a sale of 130 negroes advertised by the Hon. Robert Toombs (U. S. Senator), as administrator of Pope's estate. I expect to see as happy a set of Africanized republicans as the world ever knew. I wish you could be here at the sale; I have no doubt that you would agree that our Fourth of July celebrations are within the pale of the Constitution. If you could only make up your mind to settle an Alabama plantation, this would be a first-rate chance to stock it. The sale is advertised in the *Columbus Enquirer*, and takes place at the Court ground, Stewart Co., at the county town of Lumpkin. 'Terms, credit to 25th December next.'

E. MARSTON.

"N. B.—Negroes bought on the 4th of July and paid for on Christmas will make a good case for the higher law men, and so I send it."

ADMINISTRATOR'S SALE.—Will be sold on the first Tuesday in July next, at the Court-House door of Stewart County, within the usual hours of sale, between ninety and one hundred Negroes, consisting of men, women, boys, &c. These negroes are all very likely, and between forty and fifty of the number are men and boys. Sold as the property of Henry J. Pope, deceased, in pursuance of an order of the Court of Ordinary of Stewart County, for the benefit of heirs and creditors. Terms of sale, a credit (with interest) until 25th December next.

ROBERT TOOMBS,
June 13-wtds Adm'r of Henry J. Pope, deceased.

ATTEMPTED MURDER.—The *Lynchburg Virginian*, of July 26th, gives the following statements:

"We understand a most cold-blooded attempt was made, a few evenings since, by a negro, to take the life of a Mr. Furgerson, living a short distance over the river in Amherst.

"The following are the particulars as detailed to us, whether accurately or not we cannot say: The person upon whose life the attempt was made discovered that several depredations had been committed on his potato patch, and he suspected a negro who was in his service, either hired or belonging to him, of being guilty, and charged him with the offence. The negro denied the charge, but afterwards became uneasy, for fear it would be proved upon him, and determined, in connection with other negroes who had participated with him in the theft, to kill Furgerson.

"They accordingly employed another negro to commit the act. He prepared himself with a scythe blade and concealed himself behind a tree in the woods, about dark, where he knew Mr. Furgerson had to pass. When he came up, the negro struck at him with the blade, which fortunately hit a large key, some buttons, &c., and so broke the force of the blow as to prevent it from doing much damage. Mr. Furgerson fortunately had with him an axe, and rushed upon the negro, who took safety in flight.

"We learn that several of the negroes have been arrested, and that others are still being searched for.

"If the above are the true particulars, it was as cold-blooded and villanous an attempt at murder as ever was made, and the guilty ones will doubtless pay dearly for it."

SEDUCTION — MURDER. — The *Milford* (Del.) *Beacon*, under date of July 22, says:

"We have just received intelligence of a horrible murder perpetrated at or near Laurel, Sussex county, on Thursday night last, by a negro slave. We have not gained the full particulars, but give them as far as we have ascertained.

"It seems that a man by the name of Anderson had a negro hired by the name of Samuel Calaway, who had seduced his daughter, and, upon the fact being discovered, Anderson threatened to shoot the negro, whereupon the negro left. Anderson, however, went to the negro's master, purchased his time, and got a bill of sale. He then sold him to a trader by the name of Tindale, who employed two men, named —— Collins and —— Hearn, to take him, and the negro, having left his clothes at Anderson's, he (Anderson) sent him word that he could return and get them.

"The negro kept his clothes in a granary, or some other out-house, wherein Collins and Hearn had secreted themselves for the purpose of tying him when he entered to get them. The negro came, and Anderson went with him to this house; and when the negro entered, he (Anderson) closed the door, and the two men inside attempted to seize him, when the negro knocked Collins down with a club, and stabbed him to the heart with a heavy butcher's knife, killing him almost instantly. "Upon hearing the scuffle, Anderson rushed in, and the negro fell upon him and Hearn, cutting Hearn's throat in such a manner that his life is despaired of, and inflicting a fearful gash in Anderson's stomach, which exposed his entrails. Anderson's wound has been sewed up, and his physician has some slight hope of his recovery, but Hearn, it is feared, is beyond recovery.

"The negro is still at large, and the Governor has offered $200 for his detection. We have no doubt but he will be caught, as it is supposed that he is not out of the State yet."

P. S. The negro afterwards gave himself up, and stated that he only acted in self-defence.

OUTRAGE AT NEW RICHMOND.—We have received a long communication giving an account of the abuse and abduction of two coloured boys, at New Richmond, Clermont county, on the 6th inst. It seems a quarrel sprung up between some Irish boys and a small coloured lad, the latter of whom was badly beaten. Two older brothers of the coloured boy went to redress the wrong of their younger brother, when a general melee seems to have occurred between the Irish and other citizens, and some of the coloured people. The two older boys, after being badly used, were placed in the watch-house, by order of the Mayor, as he alleged, for safe-keeping, until the next morning; but, in the course of the night, they were taken from prison by a mob, taken over into Kentucky, there badly beaten and otherwise maltreated, and ordered not to cross the river again, lest their lives should pay the forfeit. The defenceless mother of the three boys, who had exerted herself to restrain her sons, was in the meantime seized without any process of law, put in prison, and bailed out at night, for her appearance in the morning, when no process and no charge was exhibited against her. The boys managed to cross back into Ohio in the course of the night, and hid themselves in the vicinity until the return of their father, who was absent at the time, who has commenced a suit against a number of the actors, for the maltreatment of his sons.

These, in brief, are the circumstances, as we gather them from the communication before us, which is too long, and too sweeping in its charges against the people of N. Richmond, the churches, &c., to justify us in publishing it, at present, although it may be all true. If so, we shall doubtless learn something about it from other sources. —*Columbus (O.) Columbian.*

From the *Cincinnati Columbian* we glean the following facts: "The coloured boys, James and Isaac Lott, who were recently kidnapped from New Richmond, have again made their appearance. It appears that, after being beaten, they were, on the day of the affray, thrown in jail, to await an examination, but in the middle of the night the jail doors were unlocked, and the two coloured boys taken out by twenty-five or thirty men, who took them some distance below the town to a boat, in which they crossed the Ohio River to the Kentucky shore, and there, in a hollow, far from any house, whipped the boys severely with small saplings. This was done at 1 o'clock at night. When crossing the river, part of the crowd wished to tie the hands and feet of the Lott boys, and drown them. Others protested against this, and threatened to denounce it, and the proposition was dropped. When the whipping was over, the boys were told that they would be killed if they returned to New Richmond. The crowd then left and recrossed the river. The boys, after wandering until near daylight, found a skiff and recrossed the river, and went to some friends back of Richmond.

"Their father has now commenced legal proceedings against those implicated. It appears that this is the first difficulty in which the Lott boys have ever been involved. They are not particularly bad boys, as was reported, and the fight that one of them had with a white man, just before the kidnapping, grew out of an old grudge against them, because their father claimed the right to vote, and, on his ballot being refused, sued the judges of the election. It is said that the Lotts claim descent from one of the first families of Virginia. Some Miss Mason had an illegitimate daughter, and, to hide her misfortune, the family put the child out to be raised by a coloured woman as her own. When it grew to womanhood, the master, a Mr. ——, seduced her, and then, upon his wife becoming jealous, he sold her to a Frenchman, who, after some time, set her and her child free. This child is the mother of the Lott boys, and does not appear to have a trace of African blood in her veins. She was raised in the family of Col. Bond of Zanesville, is extremely fair, and her hair will not curl. The great-grandfather of the Lott boys was an African negro, but their great-grandmother on that side was a mulatto, and their grandmother a Pennsylvania German woman, named Sarah Leunabaragher. According to this paternity, Mr. Lott and his boys are almost white."

ANOTHER BLOODY DEED.—A despatch from Baltimore says that an awful murder came to light at Danbridge, on the 16th. Elijah Moore, his wife and sister-in-law, were all found murdered in their respective beds, and their bodies terribly gashed with an axe. A negro belonging to the murdered man is missing, and it is supposed he is the author of the fiendish deed.

A correspondent of the Knoxville *Register* gives the following details of this horrid affair:

DANBRIDGE, June 21, 1854.

The deplorable scenes of horror which have occurred in this county within the last week are particularly thrilling, and strike every heart with a sting of poignant regret, which beggars description. On last Wednesday night, while Elijah Moore, his wife and sister-in-law were enjoying at home that joy and pleasure which alone could be realized in calm repose in their own domicile, a servant of said Moore stole quietly into the room in which they were sleeping, and, without provocation, murdered Moore most brutally with an axe.

Mrs. Moore, being awakened by the blows upon her husband, entreated him to desist, and for this kind entreaty, from an indulgent mistress, he felled her to the floor, and murdered her with the same axe. The scenes thus perpetrated aroused Miss Lotspeech, the sister of Mrs. Moore, a young lady of fine family and unexceptionable character, who ran to the bed where her sister and brother-in-law were being immersed in murder and their own blood; but the horror of the picture before her overawed her, and she sprang back to her own bed.

The fi

frustrated by the interference of bystanders, who "pitched into" the kidnappers with a good will. Several pistol shots were fired, blows exchanged, and brickbats brought into requisition. One of the pursuers was struck to the ground by a stone, but no one was seriously injured. The fugitives were triumphantly rescued, entertained at the Hardy House, and the next morning left, *en route* for Chicago. We understand that at Ottawa the kidnappers made a second attempt to seize the travellers, but were prevented by the authorities.

LOSS OF SLAVE PROPERTY.—A corespondent of the *Tribune*, writing from the mouth of the Little Kanawha, on the Ohio river, says:

"Property in human chattels appears to be exceedingly precarious in the region along the banks of the Ohio. According to a statement lately published in one of the papers here, within the last fifteen or twenty years some $150,000 to $200,000 of this kind of riches has taken to itself legs and ran away. And this is but one county. It is presumed that all the counties bordering on the Ohio have been equally unfortunate. The facilities for all those who choose to own (?) themselves to do so are so great that none remain but the lame and lazy. 'Who would be free, himself must' run away. The losers appear to care but little about the matter, and take it very philosophically—at least, some do."

FOUR MORE "CHATTELS" SAFE.—The *Detroit Inquirer*, of the 20th ult., states that a medical gentleman of that city, while returning to his home at a very early hour, a few mornings ago, from a visit to a sick patient, was accosted by a coloured man direct from his "old Kentucky home," who urgently requested his advice about some means of getting over the river. He had a wife and two children, one nine and the other eleven years of age, in the outskirts of the city, and the family had walked all the way from Kentucky, in night journeys, lying still during the daytime. They were hungry, destitute of money, and very weary, and the fear of being overtaken after all their wanderings and escapes, and while fairly in sight of their "promised land," made them nervous and agitated. They had fallen into good hands, however, and, after a hearty breakfast—the first food they had eaten in 24 hours—they were put on board the ferry, and safely landed in Canada.

We notice the papers in all parts of the country record frequent escapes of this nature. There is no doubt that the facilities for getting through the northern States have been much increased since the passage of the Nebraska bill, and thousands of men who have heretofore been indifferent toward lending their aid to such escapes have no scruples now. The South cancelled a good many imaginary as well as real obligations when they broke their own faith in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

ARREST OF A FUGITIVE SLAVE.—The officers of the Alvin Adams, on her last upward trip, arrested a fugitive or runaway slave, on the boat at Madison, brought him to this city, and lodged him safely and quietly in Buckner Castle. It appears that the slave in question ran away, in company with another, from John H. Page, of Bowling Green, and had managed to reach Washington, Ind., together, when this fellow left his partner and went to Madison, in the full expectation of taking a boat at Madison for Cincinnati; and once in Cincinnati, he thought he would be perfectly safe. The rascal, however, did not reach Cincinnati, but fell into honest hands, who brought him back home. 'Tis a pity they did not let the trifling fellow go to Cincinnati, and get a taste of the misnamed thing called freedom; as a week's freedom among the Abolitionists there would sicken him for life, and he would beg hard enough to get home again to his master.—*Louisville Courier.*

—It is seldom we have read a paragraph from a nigger-driving journal with greater disgust than attended our perusal of the above. The man who simply carries out the first principles of right, and obeys the instincts of liberty which create civilization and render life worth having, is called a "rascal." Verily, "chaos has come again" in the dialectics of the South. To what are we tending, when such ravings are becoming the staple literature of half the country?—*Tribune.*

SLAVE-HUNTERS IN THE EMPIRE STATE.—The following letter is from the *Lockport* (N. Y.) *Journal*:

WARREN'S CORNERS, Niagara Co., June 20, 1854.

Southern bloodhounds and slave-catchers are abroad! Our remarkably quiet neighbourhood has this day been thrown into great excitement from the appearance and suspicious deportment of some strangers. Charles Brown, a coloured man, who has resided in our midst more than two years, and who has won the respect of all who made his acquaintance, was, at an early hour this morning, rather *surprised* by the appearance of his master's nephew from Kentucky. Two gentlemen had been making strange manœuvres in the neighbourhood for one or two days, and on Tuesday they passed by the residence of Brown on the Lockport and Warren Plankroad, going toward Lockport. They stopped nearly in front of Mr. David Carlton's, and appeared to consult together in a whisper, then wheeled around and drove up the lane to Brown's house. One then went back to Mr. Carlton's and inquired for Mr. Mighells (on whose farm Brown lives); the other remained in the carriage, looking directly through the door of Brown's house, watching apparently for some one. The one in quest of Mr. Mighell pretended to want to rent his farm for the ensuing year. Brown saw him, recognized him. *It was the nephew of his old master!* Brown fled to the woods with the avowed intention of crossing Niagara River. We have not heard from him yet to-night, but we hope that he has kept clear from the river, as all the crossings are undoubtedly watched. It probably was the plan of the hunters to start him from his place and trap him there. But we *know* that *others* are on the alert, and that the fugitive will *not* be captured without a struggle.

PROBABLE KIDNAPPING IN ILLINOIS.—The following letter is from the *Tribune:*

LASALLE, July 15, 1854.

On the night of July 13, while the cars from Rock Island halted at Lasalle, waiting for St. Louis passengers, the Rev. Wm. Salter, of Burling, Iowa, was attracted to the platform by loud conversation. The cause of this disturbance was as follows:

Two coloured men, who had bought tickets for Chicago, were held by three apparently professional bullies, who said the former should not go on. It was near midnight and there were few men about the depot. The kidnappers had one hand on the collar of the men, and the other near a pistol or knife. All other voices were drowned by their threats and oaths. I asked, "Are you officers?" "No." "Have you served any papers?" "No." I then said "these men are not criminals, and they must go on." I used a little force, and a pistol was presented to me with defiance. What should we do? Mr. Salter did as much or more than any one; peace men and all unarmed, and with the exception of a few valiant boys about us, who said the men should not go back, we could not tell friend from foe. I heard no one speak who did not denounce the kidnappers; but we were all strangers, and every act seemed to court death. As we waited for an officer, the cars started and we with them.

Who will furnish the sequel to this outrage? Were the individuals referred to kidnappers secure of their prey? We passed into the down train. As we met it and gave the alarm, Captain Price of the Gorden City said one of them was free, and took his papers to keep them, and I have since learned the other to be a respectable resident of Chicago. Will Illinois redress this outrage? We shall see. J. B. G.

A SENATOR BIRD.—A clergyman lately informed us that some years ago he kept a station, in a small town, on the underground railroad. They did a large carrying trade. A wealthy, worthy farmer, living some miles out of town, used to remonstrate against the business, and declared that it was a duty to return the slave to his master. It was a painful duty, but still a duty, and as such he would perform it.

Well, one day the slave-catchers came to the town and put up posters offering a reward of $800 for the apprehension of nine slaves. Soon after dark the slaves themselves made their appearance, and what *was* to be done? Escape by the usual route was impossible! The suspected houses were all likely to be searched, and nobody knew what to do. Our informant counselled that they be sent to the farmer with the stern sense of duty, and one of the posters offering the reward be sent with them. This was finally agreed to; and the poor fellows were dispatched to plead their own cause. Next day nothing was heard of the slaves or the farmer, but the second day our informant met him, and shaking hands says: "Well M—— where are those slaves? I suppose you sent them back to their masters?"

"Their masters—the d—l" was the indignant reply. "My team was gone all last night carrying them to ——. It is easy to talk about sending them back, but when it comes to the trial a man cannot do it!"

From that time he kept a station, and it was far from being the last night that his horses were gone on a similar errand.

This is a proof that Mrs. Stowe's "Senator Bird" is not a fictitious or improbable character, and we agree with the farmer in saying that if sending slaves back to their masters is a duty, it is one that *a man cannot* perform. Senator Sumner was quite right in answering, when asked if he would return a fugitive: "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?" It is the work of a dog, and a man could not possibly perform it. —*Pittsburgh Visiter.*

A HARD CASE.—Mr. BROWN, of Henderson, Ky., was recently arrested and thrown into prison, at that place, upon the charge of assisting a negro woman and child to make their escape from slavery. At the same time his goods were seized upon, and his family—consisting of a wife and two children—driven from the place. The following slip, cut from the Louisville *Journal* of June 20, shows the kind of means which are being taken to secure Mr. Brown's conviction:

"HENDERSON, June 6, 1854.

"DEAR SIR: The citizens here have raised for you, and those who assist you, one hundred dollars for the apprehension and lodgment in the Union county of jail, Brown, charged with stealing negroes. The citizens here and in Morganfield authorized Mr. Harris to say to you that for the apprehension and sending to the penitentiary of Brown, who is thus charged, they would see that five hundred dollars would be paid you; should you produce against Brown such testimony as will convict him of stealing slaves from this side of the river, you may rely upon getting this sum from the citizens—say five hundred dollars, less the $100 now enclosed to you. Please acknowledge the $100 enclosed.

"Yours respectfully,
"ARCH. DIXON,
"A. J. ANDERSON."

We have received a letter from Mrs. Brown, from Princeton, in this State, enclosing another from Mr. Baker, a lawyer of Evansville, in which he says he wrote to Mr. Harris, of Henderson, in regard to the facts of Mr. Brown's case, and from his reply he is satisfied there is no evidence against the accused worthy of the name. Mrs. Brown appears very much distressed about the situation of her husband, and is without the means of procuring counsel to defend him. We hope the friends of humanity will render her such assistance as they may be able, in order that her husband may have the benefit of a fair trial. The term of the court at which he is to be tried, will commence on the third Monday in October.—*Indianapolis Free Dem.*

SLAVE CASE IN OHIO.—A correspondent writes to the *Tribune* from Circleville, Ohio, under date of July 17, as follows:

"A week or two ago a man by the name of Williams and his wife, who formerly lived in this county, but now are residents of New Orleans, made a visit to this place, bringing with them a female slave aged about 12 years. While here Mrs. Williams, in order to show the privileges enjoyed by Southern ladies, but the right and privilege of every American, to 'wallop his own nigger,' gave her said servant a cowhiding, whereupon she proceeded to decamp, and took refuge among the darkies, who expounded to her the Constitution of the United States and the learned decisions of Judges. Being so instructed she declined to return to the happy state of slavery in Louisiana.

"Mr. Williams regarded the whole proceeding as an outrage, and expected our 'free and enlightened citizens' to turn out *en masse* and engage in the pleasant and gentlemanly recreation of slave-hunting. This community has always enjoyed the reputation of being great haters of Abolitionists, owing to the strong infusion of Virginia blood in the inhabitants. But since the passage of the Nebraska bill, and certain late speeches in Congress, and taunts in Southern papers, our people are unwilling to be 'nigger-catchers' for southern gentlemen any longer. Accordingly Mr. Williams was informed that his slave, having been brought into Ohio by himself, was free, and that he could not, against her will, take her from the State, and that any attempt to take her by violence was kidnapping, an offence making the party guilty liable to 'be confined in the penitentiary at hard labour for any space of time not less than three nor more than seven years, at the discretion of the Court.'

"Of course in every community there are men who are ready to do a dirty job, from catching niggers to voting for a Nebraska bill, in consideration of office bestowed on a relative. A few persons of this stamp proposed to assist in seizing the girl, at all events. But when they learned that she was in the hands of the 'coloured population' who *would fight*, they desisted from the attempt, having a decent regard for their personal safety. Mr. Williams returned to New Orleans *minus* one slave, and she remains under the care of her coloured friends, who are sending her to school.

"Since the passage of the Nebraska bill we propose to let the southern gentlemen catch their own niggers. H."

RUNAWAY SLAVES AND UNION-SAVERS.—A fortnight ago, the writer of this was travelling from Cincinnati to the lake. In the emigrant cars were eighteen or twenty slaves, "breaking" for Canada on their own hook. In the passenger cars were a number of Southerners, on their way to the northern watering-places. In the same seat with the writer was a Kentuckian. The writer asked whether the Southerners aboard would not feel an interest in reclaiming the fugitives and returning them to their owners. He somewhat indignantly replied, that "the people of the slave States were not in the habit of catching other people's slaves—that every man was expected to run down his own niggers, or hire a class of loafers called "nigger-catchers" to do it for him.

"How, then, can you ask the northern people to perform a service for you so disgraceful and revolting that none but southern loafers can be induced to engage in it?"

"Oh," replied Kentuck, "that is a constitutional *obligation*, binding upon the northern States. It is their legal duty to help to return and deliver up our runaway niggers; the Fugitive law is not in force in the South; it was only intended to prevent your Abolitionists from harbouring our escaped 'property,' or helping it off to Canada."

"But, sir, consider the insult that such a barbarian law inflicts on northern sentiment; how it must shock every feeling of humanity; how its unconstitutional and savage provisions trample upon the fundamental principles of common law and justice, as administered by the courts in all other cases involving life, liberty and property."

"Can't help that," said the Kentuckian; "the Supreme Court has decided it constitutional. Your northern people are not so averse to the enforcement of the law as you imagine. A reward of a few hundred dollars very quickly dispels their sentiments of humanity, and sets them on the trail of the runaway niggers. They become very ardent and patriotic in the chase, feeling that they are discharging a constitutional duty. A great many of your northern men are very fond of living up to the constitution in all such cases. They dislike niggers; and if your State constitution permitted it, these same folks would be slaveholders in Ohio, and make the hardest kind of masters. Then, again, many of your politicians are more devoted to the 'peculiar institution' than we of the South, and on them we chiefly rely for its perpetuity. You never can Abolitionize the North; there will always be plenty of what you term 'dough faces' to accomplish our purposes, and keep you fanatical fellows in the traces; we could not get along without them, and they would not be happy without our approving smiles."

"Your remarks may apply to the past," said we, "but not to the present; since the violation of the Missouri Compromise, a new spirit is awakened in the North. A general determination prevails to cast aside party prejudices, and rally for the defence of free institutions, and to put a final stop to the aggressions of the slave power."

He laughed incredulously in our face—"Don't lay that flattering unction to your soul, my good sir," said he. "Already the press of one of the great parties of the North are exhorting their party to 'acquiesce' in the onward march of 'popular sovereignty,' and before six months that portion of the Whig press which advocated Fillmore and Webster against Scott will fall in with the Democratic press, and urge Northern 'acquiescence' on Union-saving grounds. If they are hard pressed, they will join the Democratic party, and overthrow the more radical class. Mark my predictions."

"As to myself," continued the Kentuckian, "I wish it were otherwise; I wish your northern people had the pluck and manhood to stand by their convictions of right. If they had, we should soon have an emancipation party in the South that would free the northern slave States before many years. Last week two of my niggers ran away; I know where they are, but I shall not pursue them. If they can do better free than slave, it is *their* right to enjoy freedom. I should be glad to find, on my return, that every slave in Kentucky had run off, and I assure you we should never permit any more to be held in that State. We realize the pernicious effects of the institution upon our prosperity; but the question is, how to get rid of it. While you have so many 'doughfaces' in the North, our people would never do anything to remove it. This class are its shield and protection. They aid and abet it, and it must last as long as they do. But to change the subject, what is the name of this place we are coming to."

The words of the Kentuckian in regard to the Fillmore press are coming true already. The Detroit *Advertiser*, Buffalo *Commercial*, Albany *Rapister*, New York *Commercial* and Boston *Courier* are playing their "Union-saving cards" over again, and we have no doubt but they are ready and willing to "fuse" in party, as they have in principle, with the Administration prints. But there is this difference between the present time and three years ago, that not one in six of the so-called Silver Grays will follow them.

The "acquiescing, Union-saving" business will not pay expenses hereafter; and the result of this Fall's elections will so clearly demonstrate this fact, that we will hear no more of this croaking outside of the servile ranks of the pro-slavery Democracy.—*Cleveland Leader.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT.—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 5, 1854.

CENTRALIZATION.

CENTRALIZATION is at once the natural tendency and the certain curse of modern governments. Power delights to lie ensconced in the centre of its domains, like a spider at the citadel of his radiating lines of entrenchment, ready to dart with equal ease and certainty upon any cause of offence, near or remote. There are certain conveniences, undoubtedly, gained by the simplification of the arrangements of government; but they are conveniences bought at a price greatly exceeding their real value. If the ardent aspirations of our United States Judges could be gratified, and the cumbrous machinery of trial by Jury be abolished, and the entire disposition of our lives and fortunes be put at the mercy of our Kanes, Griers, Curtises and Spragues, it would simplify matters very much; but we doubt whether, on the whole, we should be much the gainers by the process. So as to all matters of legislation affecting individual conduct or industry, a general scheme for a wide extent of country often seems in the abstract to be convenient and beneficial, and yet is found in the concrete to be tyrannical and oppressive. At any rate, it has the effect of dwarfing the extremities for the undue development of the head, and often results in the most fatal mischiefs to both.

In Europe, the last foot-holds which liberty maintained on the continent were in the provinces and the free cities. As despotism advanced its meshes and enclosed within their entangling snares one popular privilege after another, the franchises of the Free Cities and the rights of the provincial legislative and judicial bodies were crushed in fatal succession. And at last Absolutism sat on all the continental thrones and held the keys of life and death for all within the prisons called Kingdoms or Empires. It was a convenience, on many accounts, to have all governing powers concentrated in a single hand; but it was at the expense of all the contrivances by which the jealousy of liberty had protected the exercise of individual or corporate rights. The wolves in the fable persuaded the sheep to give up the clumsy and boisterous defence of their watch-dogs; but as soon as the guardians were disposed of, the silly sheep were at the mercy of the greed of the wolves. The Centralization of the British Empire may seem to be an exception to the general rule. But if it be one, it is owing to the popular character of the English Government, as compared with those of the continent, and the great British rights which were thus given a wider sphere of operation. Bad as the misgovernment of Ireland may have been since the Union, it has been certainly less gross in its abuses than it was before. And Scotland seems to have sat down contented at last with the material advantages which have accrued to her from her Union with England. But it has been done in both cases by the denationalizing of nations. Scotland and Ireland are now but provinces; Edinburgh and Dublin but provincial towns, with none of the attributes of capitals. Though fewer mischiefs may have flowed from this centralization than from those of the continental States, it does not follow that all the good that either of them derived from their Union with England might not have been acquired and maintained, with equal certainty and with more dignity, under their old nationalities.

The prophetic hearts of the generation that adopted the Constitution divined the dangers which lurked under a Confederated Concentration of Government. Just apprehensions were felt lest the overshadowing influences of the Central Power would override and trample down the rights of the separate States and the individual citizens. It was from this wise jealousy that the original parties arose. Only it has happened that when the States Rights men have had the possession of the National Government they have felt as strong a determination towards Centralization and the strengthening of the hand of the General Government as ever the Federal party had done. The party that trembled lest John Adams should sap the foundations of popular liberty with the Alien and Sedition Laws had no scruple about buying Louisiana and making States out of all that territory, even down to the present day. The natural and necessary tendency of power is to consolidate and perpetuate itself, and Centralization is one of the favourite methods of doing both these things. The cruel injustice of the men that made the Constitution to their posterity, in making Slavery an integral power of the government they created, has exaggerated and intensified this tendency. Tyrants by nature, education and necessity having given to them a determinate part in the government, a part which has at last grown to be the whole, and their controlling influence having been made to depend on the development and strengthening of their tyranny, it is not to be wondered at that they should use every means they can to secure and enlarge their power. With every inducement to study and practice the peculiar statecraft which belongs to our politics, it is not remarkable that they should have become adepts in it. And with the increasing revenues of the country and the widening patronage which has grown from strength to strength with our years, it is by no means strange that they should have found pliant tools ready to do their worst work. Things being as they are in this country, the necessary outgrowth of the character given to our institutions by their founders, it has been a necessity that Slavery should obtain the direction of our affairs, and that, having it, she should seek to make the whole frame of government, and all its parts, tributary to its power.

Now, the only effectual way of counteracting this tendency to vicious Centralization is to set up the Rights of the Single States in active opposition to it. Liberty is only to be maintained, and, if lost, recovered, by an active conflict of opposing opinions. The wide field opened to ambition by the General Government, and the more ample rewards extended by it, gives it a fearful advantage in a country governed by the corrupt and profligate politicians that have so long reigned over us. A National Revolution is a Moral and Political Impossibility. It is a waste of energy and of means to expend them in the attempt to scale the battlements of that Pandemonium. They are so contrived and so manned as to be absolutely impregnable. The only hope for the preservation of the rights of States and individuals lies in the energies and virtue of the States and individuals themselves. Whether there be enough left of either to suffice for salvation remains to be seen. We are inclined to hope, from the indications shown by the people, when they can act independently of the tricky politicians, that a vindication of State Rights is not an impossibility. The insults to which the North has been subjected for the past four years, merely for the sake of insult, have not been without their effect. But great is the counteracting influence of political leaders and presses, pretending to sympathize with the popular indignation, but only for the purpose of thwarting it. There is to be a great struggle, first, for emancipation from Northern leaders, who hope one day to have the help of these very Slaveholding miscreants for their own political elevation, as a necessary preliminary to the one which is to free us from Southern domination.

A true Northern party must be aroused in the Free States, the ambitious hopes of which must depend on the predominance of the North. The essential principle of the party should be the perfect purification of each Northern State from all connection with Slavery, whatever construction men choose to put on the Constitution. Fugitive Slaves should be openly protected by law. Masters in pursuit and all in their employment, whether United States officials or not, should be virtually declared out of the protection of law, and whoever killed them should be adjudged to have done only an act of self-defence. If arrested, they should be subject to the punishment of felons. And no Governors or Judges should be chosen or endured who would not carry out these laws. These things can be done, for the converse of them are done, in behalf of Slavery, in all the Slaveholding States. What men have done, men may do, and it is not impossible that the bloody instructions the slaveholders have been giving us, for the last sixty years, may yet return to plague the inventors. This seems to us the only platform on which an Anti-Slavery party can establish itself. Having occupied this position, it may find itself strong enough to attack the National citadel with some good possibility of success. The destructive energies of the Know-Nothings, which seem to be directed for the demolition of both parties, may produce a political Chaos out of which a new and a better Creation may yet spring. It may be that they are not only pulling down, but that they are building better than they know. Anything that goes towards the destruction of the old, battered, vicious political organizations must be accepted as the promise of something better. May it come and speedily.

PREACHING.

THE *Times* took occasion, recently, to preach a little, in its way, to the Preachers, and to define for them the limitations of pulpit duty. The text of its discourse was a sermon of some unnamed clergyman on Railroads, which, it seems, had shocked its notions of ministerial propriety. After some flippant talk, and some feeble attempts at wit, the *Times* ended its prelection by reiterating the old cant about preaching "Christ and him crucified," the duty of confining religious instruction to "spiritual matters," "the plan of salvation," &c. To this lecture of our political and commercial neighbour, Henry Ward Beecher replied, in the *Independent*, in his own direct and forcible style. We cannot resist the temptation to copy a few of his raciest passages.

"In short, it is not the duty of the pulpit *to teach men their secular professions or trades.* But it is its duty to teach men how *to avoid the special temptations of those callings*, and how *specifically to carry themselves like Christians, amidst their avocations.* Ought the pulpit to teach a man his duties to his family? How to rear and instruct his children? Is it the duty of the pulpit to teach a parishioner to be industrious, virtuous, honest, frugal, generous and thrifty?

"Will the *Times* inform us how a minister can teach these things without touching *secular topics?* A clergyman must teach *industry*, but not for his life must he let it be known that he means ploughing, sowing, teaming, digging, mowing or reaping! It is his duty to teach *frugality.* But that must be done by discussing the abstract nature of frugality; not by mentioning household affairs, not by teaching by actual facts, not by delineating a spendthrift, by pointing out actual extravagance, not by mentioning in the pulpit such vulgar topics as the expense of luxuries, the needless waste of means upon drink or tobacco, not by mentioning a table too full, extravagant parties, ambitious equipage, inordinate love of dress, or any other actual vice of improvidence. No. Let him search out some text, stroke it and pat it asleep; then deduce from it some sentimental reflections upon the folly of not doing right, and the evils in general of doing wrong; and, as the clock comes round to the appointed half hour, let him bring out the eloquent sentences kept in reserve to round off with, and then dismiss his congregation to outrageous Sunday-dinners and Sunday-afternoon rides, that consume all the earnings of the week.

"These ideas of the *Times* are a fair exponent of the ideas of multitudes about the sacredness of the Sabbath, and of the pulpit. That which is sacred with them is that which is purely *conceptional.* That which is irreverent is that which lives, and is real. Strip a deed down to its abstract principle, clothe that principle in philosophic language, address it to the mere intellect, and *that* is allowable preaching. But take the act as it stands in life, measure it by the spirituality of the New Testament, speak in plain colloquial terms, such as men use in their daily affairs, and which carry with them the sympathies of men, and our secular purists are at once alarmed for the dignity of the pulpit.

"MAN AND HUMAN LIFE will never be regenerated until ministers feel that all systems of truth and all doctrines are but the servants and medicines of men and human life. And he who can most vividly and accurately take up *life as it is*, and hold it over against *life as it should be*, will be the man who will the most pungently reach the great common heart, and teach the greatest number of men their real spiritual condition.

"We have no doubt that a rigorous landlord, having sharked it all the week, screwing and gripping among his tenants, would be better pleased, on Sunday, to doze through an able Gospel sermon on Divine mysteries than to be kept awake by a practical sermon that, among other things, set forth the duties of a Christian landlord. A broker, who has gambled on a magnificent scale all the week, does not go to church to have his practical swindling analyzed and measured by the 'New Testament' spirit. Catechism is what he wants—doctrine is to his taste. A merchant, whose last bale of smuggled goods was safely stored on Saturday night, and his brother merchant, who, on that same day, swore a false invoice through the custom-house—they go to church to hear a sermon on faith, on angels, on the resurrection. As they have nothing invested in those subjects, they expect the minister to be bold and orthodox. But if he wants respectable merchants to pay ample pew rents, let him not vulgarize the pulpit by introducing commercial questions. A rich Christian brother owns largely in a distillery, and is clamorous against letting down the pulpit to the vulgarity of temperance sermons. Another man buys tax-titles, and noses about all the week to see who can be slipped out of a neglected lot. On Sunday he naturally wishes us to preach about eternity, or moral ability and inability. A mechanic that plies his craft with the unscrupulous appliance of every means that will win, he, too, wants 'doctrine' on the Sabbath, not these secular questions. Men wish two departments in life: the secular and the religious. Between them a high wall, and opaque, is to be built. They wish to do just what they please for six long days. Then, stepping the other side of the wall, they wish the minister to assuage their fears, to comfort their conscience, and furnish them a clear ticket and insurance for heaven. By such a shrewd management, our modern financiers are determined to show that a Christian can serve two masters, both God and mammon, at the same time."

RUNNING AWAY FROM HAPPINESS.—The New Orleans *Picayune* of June 18 contained eleven distinct advertisements of runaway slaves. The aggregate amount of the rewards offered for their apprehension is $510. Several of the number are said to be marked by "scars" of one sort or another; one is suspected of having gone to see his sister; another is said to be a cook, and the public are warned against employing him and paying him for his work; another (a girl) is said to have a "mild and gentle voice" and to be "well-formed"; several speak French as well as English; one is said to be "very sprightly, with a good address"; and another is said to have been "brought up in the house," to be "almost white," and to have "straight hair." Following these advertisements of runaways are the cards of three regular dealers in human flesh, who tell the public that they have a supply of mechanics, field hands, house servants, carriage drivers, washers, nurses, ironers, cooks, &c., embracing men, women, boys, and "likely young girls." Such are some of the statistics of the traffic in slaves and souls of men, as carried on in a professedly Christian city and under republican institutions!

FIRST OF AUGUST AT FLUSHING.

THE Twentieth Anniversary of West India Emancipation was celebrated on Tuesday last, at Flushing, by the New York Anti-Slavery Society and such other friends of the cause as chose to unite in its observance. The day, though warm, was clear and beautiful, a copious shower in the morning having laid the dust and rendered the atmosphere salubrious. At 9 o'clock, A.M., a large party embarked on the steamer *Island City*, and, after a pleasant passage up the river, were landed near "St. Ronan's Well," a beautiful Grove surmounting a bluff which commands a fine view of Flushing Bay and the opposite shore. At 10 o'clock, another large party took passage by the rail-road line, and after their arrival at the Grove, the exercises of the day commenced.

The meeting having been called to order by Mr. LAUREN WETMORE, President of the Society, prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. HODGES (coloured) of Williamsburgh. Hon. HORACE GREELEY then addressed the assembly as follows.

MR. GREELEY'S SPEECH.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I shall venture but for a brief season to demand your attention, after which, I believe, an adjournment to dinner is to take place. I hope therefore that my dull remarks will be received with some measure of attention.

I shall illustrate, first by a historical passage, what is to-day the great obstacle to the emancipation of the enslaved.

In the days of Greek glory and fame, when the great men of Greece were the great men of the world; while that little territory, shut up between the mountains of Albania and the sea, not so large as the State of New York, was the home of the foremost men of the world and was the centre of the world, Greece was the great, if not the greatest, slaveholding State in the world. The Athenian democracy, as it was called, consisted of some 20,000 freemen owning more than 100,000 slaves; and that was the cause ultimately of the ruin of the Grecian Republic. In those days when Athens was the greatest city in the world—not in population or magnitude, but in soul—she had two great men, great above all others—Aristides, surnamed the Just, and Themistocles who was regarded as the ablest man of Greece. At one time Themistocles came before the people of Athens in Assembly and said he had a project in his mind which would certainly make Athens the mistress of the world, but it could not be spoken in open council and therefore he wished to commend it confidentially to some person or persons whom the Athenians should appoint. With one accord all the people said, let Aristides alone decide whether it shall be adopted or not. So the two went into a private room and Themistocles revealed the object to Aristides. He pointed out the Macedonian fleet lying in a neighbouring position and said it was in their power. Let Athens, said he, proceed at once and burn this fleet, and then we shall be the great mistress of the world. Aristides went to the Athenian people, and without revealing the project to them, simply said that the plan of Themistocles would be most advantageous to Athens, but at the same time it would be most unjust. Upon this state of things the people decided that it should not be attempted. And it is recorded in the history of their country that the people decided, without knowing what the plan was, that an attempt which would be unjust, though most advantageous, should be desisted from.

Now the great folly which lies at the foundation of all the world's miseries at this day is this: Mankind believe that an unjust act may be a beneficial act—that they can benefit themselves by oppressing or wronging their fellow men. Go through Wall Street to-day; shrewd, practical, active, intelligent as it is, Wall Street to-day believes that though slavery is very bad for the slave, yet, after all, that it is a convenient and pleasant thing for the master, and convenient for those men who are the allies, the factors, the traders and the friends of the master. That is the fatal error of to-day. You ask the man of the street, the man of the counter, the hotel keeper, if slavery is not a bad thing, and he will say, "O yes; I would not like to have my children slaves. But the slaves come into no relation with me. The masters are my customers or my guests; they send their sons to be educated at the college with which I am connected; and therefore I must say nothing, or if I say anything I must acquiesce." And this keeps the North silent; this keeps the free States chained to the car of Slavery to-day.

I have very much sympathy with that fearless, outright, outspoken sentiment of which William Lloyd Garrison is the head; which says, "Let us have no alliance with slavery" (applause). And I would be willing to try to cut it off if I knew where the sound part was and could tell just where to separate it. But where is it? If we dissolve our relations with slavery, I tell you, you have got to draw the line a great way this side of Mason and Dixon's line—this side of the counters, of the law offices, and, I am afraid, of too many of the pulpits of the free States; for there lies the danger. If the North was free in sentiment; if the North could forget that it is not the black man only that is concerned, then we might draw the line of demarkation. In old times slavery was not confined to colour or race. Any person might become a slave. The slaves of Greece, like those of Persia, were not black people particularly. The slaves of the Romans were such as happened to be vanquished or overcome in war and thereupon were sold. But to-day the line of colour is drawn between slaves and freemen, and the general rule is, that no one is supposed to be in danger of slavery unless African blood runs in his veins. The great mass of the white people say, Slavery does not concern, endanger or threaten us, and therefore like the priest and the Levite of old, they pass by on the other side.

Here is the danger. Men do not realize, do not believe, that that which oppresses men of another colour oppresses them also. *I* believe it because I know it. I never was a slave and cannot therefore speak of the wrongs of the slave as the slave only can. No man is qualified to speak of it and show what a hateful thing it is unless its chains have been around his limbs and its lash upon his back. Such men as Frederick Douglass and Samuel R. Ward, who have themselves felt the oppressor's rod, can give a true picture of Slavery, can describe it as it deserves to be described. But I have been the associate and friend of the men of the South—the white men—and I can see how it crushes them. I have seen their country dosolate as though scourged by God—as it doubtless is—and running to poverty. I have seen their men without industry, without true energy, without proper manhood. I have seen a whole country laid waste by slavery, its cities the spoil of disease. Year after year the people of the South hold their futile conventions to see how they shall build up commerce and make Southern vessels the carriers of Southern products, and southern cities marts of southern trade. They pass resolutions declaring that New York, Philadelphia and Liverpool shall no more engross the trade of the South; but they never say, we will get rid of slavery, which is the basis and foundation of their calamities. They do not realize that eternal justice is the first interest of every man—the interest of the tyrant no less than the slave—the interest of the ruler no less than the ruled. They mistakenly feel and believe that slavery is an evil to the slave only and not the master and his allies. That is the calamity of the age, their's the calamity which men have too long borne and suffered. It has carried down nation after nation to an ignominious grave, and will carry ours too unless we realize that every man's rights are involved in one man's rights—unless we realize that where there is one slave all men are more or less enslaved—unless we realize that chronic injustice—legalized, sanctioned, constitutionally protected injustice, is the great danger and the great evil of the age, as of all ages.

We are assembled to-day to celebrate an Anniversary of one of the noblest events in human history. There have been emancipations before this. There have been occasions when men said we will sin no more. But there has never been in the history of the world an event like this, where a people, not themselves slaveholders, but only the allies and backers of slaveholders, went forward and said, "We have sinned. It is wrong in these men to hold slaves, but it is wrong in us to protect and govern them in holding slaves. Therefore we pay the penalty of our sin." Thus the English nation went forward and, by one magnanimous act, paid a hundred million dollars that England might be free from the stain of Slavery (applause). And that nation has been stronger, happier and more prosperous from that day to this, and will be, I doubt not, till the end of time, for that noble act (applause).

Twenty years have elapsed, and to-day we celebrate the twentieth anniversary of West India emancipation. Has England ever repented of that act? Has England ever turned back from that step? I have never seen any evidence of relenting on her part. I believe she has always been richer for the hundred million dollars she spent to free herself from slavery. I believe this day she is more powerful and more likely to endure than she would have been but for that act; and whether she shall be our ally or our enemy through future years, I shall ever honour Great Britain for that noble act (applause).

But how did it take place? How came Great Britain, from being a slave-trading and a slaveholding nation indirectly, to work emancipation? There is instruction in the history of that act, and I shall briefly glance at it.

The process which made England a free nation was a very gradual process. When Thomas Clarkson, William Wilberforce and a few others commenced the work of emancipation, they stood alone in the nation. The Press, the commerce, the aristocracy, the priesthood of England were all against them. They struggled year after year with very little ground or hope of success. They were a handful of men and women, generally poor and uninfluential, strong only in the might of a great truth, strong only in the assertion that man has no right to own property in man. They often divided in Parliament when they had not a dozen on their side; often brought forward their measures when they could hardly be seconded; and yet they went on, year after year—not hopeless, not despairing; for they felt that they had God on their side, and would in the end have the majority on their side. They felt that the interests of men were on the side of justice, and that justice would ultimately prevail.

And I rejoice to know that many of those pioneers in the work of emancipation lived to see it fully carried into effect. I rejoice to believe that Thomas Clarkson did not close his eyes until he saw the last British slave emancipated. So it has been, and so it will be, I think, with some of the pioneers of emancipation in this country. I trust there is time for this nation to repent of its sins and cover itself with the glory of being a second emancipating power. We cannot be the first, because we are to-day darker and guiltier in slaveholding than any nation on earth, except, possibly, Brazil. Our nation holds slaves. Our government sells slaves—takes slaves for debt and sells them to pay its debts. Our government holds slaves in its Capital, in its prisons, in its custom-houses. The American nation is to-day indirectly, as Great Britain was, but still practically, a slaveholding nation. Men believe they can be strong in the weakness of others; that they can be wise in the enforced ignorance of others; that they can be rich in the lifelong poverty of others; and so they go on and multiply excuses, prevarications, and postpone the day of emancipation. Our country is slaveholding to-day because it chooses to be slaveholding. If the northern States were free in spirit, they would cease to be the allies and accomplices of slaveholders. They could do it if they would. The difficulty is not the want of power, but the want of will. They have the power to do everything they choose. They have the power to take their stand on the side of eternal right, and say to those whose slaves run away, "If we must pay for them, we will do it, but to chase and catch them we never can do, because it is contrary to the laws of conscience and of God." The North might say that, and some day it must say it; for every year multiplies, not here only, but in the South, the number of men who investigate slavery, and who, because they investigate, must become convinced of the evil of slavery.

A friend of mine, a few years since, resided in Charleston, S. C., and was himself constructively a slaveholder there. In that city assembled, weekly, during the cooler season, a great club, in which all the first men were supposed to be embraced, to investigate and discuss various questions. At one of these meetings, incidentally, the question of slavery was broached, and two or three men, who were northern men by birth, proposed to demonstrate, not the immorality, impropriety or injustice of slavery, but that it was a great mistake of economy—that they lost money, instead of making money, by holding slaves. Well, as it was rather too late to take up the subject that evening, it was proposed to discuss it at the next meeting. The evening came; and when these two or three northern men came, lo! they found nothing but empty benches, and, after waiting till nine o'clock, they went away. The friends of slavery knew that it would not do to discuss the subject. And it will not do to-day at the South to have moral questions raked up from their foundations. It will not do to have men discuss freely, and in a friendly way, any question which goes to the root of any evil. Even the temperance question is killed there. A friend of mine, who talked temperance there, said he found it would not do to drive the temperance reform in the South, because the people feel too sensitive. Many who never drank a drop were the deadly enemies of the temperance reform, because they did not dare to have men's habits and appetites brought into the scales of eternal justice and weighed. They knew that it would weigh down slavery in the end.

And thus it is that the South is a moral desolation—that their great men, their wise men, their pious men, their ruling classes are continually called upon to apologize or speak tenderly in reference to great wrongs and evils. It is only a few days since one of their most eminent clergymen, Rev. Wm. T.

owned houses enough in Fifth Avenue, and were numbered among the aristocracy, you would be considered as good as anybody else. Take any of our rich merchants and traders to Jamaica, and, if there is money to be got by going among the black men, attending their balls and suppers, they will quick enough do it. The question is, is there money to be made out of them? If the black men in New York were as rich as the white people, they would take the same position. They want money just like all others to get education and position. Then I say you ought to try to get into the best trades; to make your children carpenters, builders and architects, and whatever will elevate them and bring them into position. Let your children learn those trades and pursuits by which they can make money and command that respect which sordid men will give to money when they will not give it to men. I know you will be faithful, and, by temperance, virtue, diligence, self-denial and faithful service to your brethren and sisters in bondage, the blessing of God will be upon you.

The meeting then adjourned till 2 1-2 o'clock, to afford opportunity for dinner, which was taken pic-nic fashion, the people gathering into little groups, some in the dining hall and others in the cool shade of the trees. The only circumstance that marred in any degree the pleasure of the company was the presence of an establishment where intoxicating drinks were for sale. The proprietor, we think, was made sensible that an Anti-Slavery Pic Nic is the poorest place in the world for a drunkard manufactory.

At the appointed hour the meeting again assembled, and, after the singing of an appropriate hymn, was addressed in an able and interesting manner, by Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY. of Syracuse. We have a report of his speech, which we are compelled to defer till next week.

Mr. May was followed by DENNIS HARRIS, Esq., of this city, JOHN O. WATTLES, of Indiana, Thomas Van Renssalaer, Rev. Mr. Hodges, Jeremiah Powers and others, of whose remarks we have no report. The speeches were interspersed with appropriate music, under the direction of Mr. Robert Hamilton.

The exercises closed about 6 o'clock, and the company soon afterwards embarked for the city.

THE GREYTOWN AFFAIR AND THE PHILADELPHIA LEDGER.

THE *Tribune*, speaking of the unanimity of the press in the condemnation of the cowardly and wanton outrage committed in the bombardment of Greytown, says: "Among all the papers which have spoken we know of but one, and that an obscure and scurrilous sheet in this city, which has attempted to find an excuse for the measure." The Editor, when he wrote this, had not seen the Philadelphia *Ledger*. The following extract from a recent letter of the *Ledger*'s regular Washington correspondent, shows that the "obscure and scurrilous sheet" is not entirely alone in its defence of this infamous transaction.

"The burning of Greytown, to procure satisfaction for our Minister to Central America, though severely commented upon by some of the opposition presses at the North, does not seem to disturb the equanimity of Congress. Greytown had, probably, the worst population of any city on earth, and smoking out the inhabitants, and obliging them to build new shantees, will afford them a healthful recreation, and teach them industrious habits. The burning of that town is, no doubt, the most practical demonstration that the British are no longer enjoying or exercising a protectorate over the Mosquito coast. It was reserved for the present Administration, practically, to enforce the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and to convince the good people of Nicaragua that it was not a dead letter on which England can put any construction she pleases."

This heartless, unprincipled and illogical apology of the mercenary correspondent of the *Ledger* is of a piece with the transaction itself. The one is equal to the other in baseness.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

A PORTRAIT.

WE have undoubted authority for saying that the sketch of character which we publish below was given under the following circumstances. A letter from WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON was put into a blank envelope, which was sealed and given to a man wholly ignorant of what was within, and whence it came. He handed it to a young woman equally ignorant on the same points, and she, after holding it upon her forehead for a short time, gave this sketch of the, to her, unknown writer of the letter. Mr. Garrison's friends, we think, will generally agree with us in saying that the sketch is, in most particulars, wonderfully accurate. Of the nature of the process by which it purports to have been made, or of the philosophy by which many intelligent minds pretend to account for this and other similar facts, we say nothing; the question lying beyond the scope of this journal. As a portrait of the Pioneer of the American Anti-Slavery Movement, it will gratify many of our readers.

THE influence this character has upon me is very marked, also very unusual. I feel that I would like to argue upon some important subject, and that I could do so with great force. I would like to be doing something publicly in the way of reforms. I take the writer of this to be a man of very individual mental organization. He is what the world calls "a man of one idea." That one idea, however, will expand his nature greatly. He has large mental combativeness, which shows itself in deadly resistance to whatever he feels to be wrong; though he despises physical force as a means to the accomplishing of his object. He would govern the world by conscience rather than by law, even. The only fighting this man will do will be by words; and these are oftimes "sharper than any two-edged sword." As a public speaker, he has language, force, logic and argument; has always a clear understanding of his subject, and from his own standing-point looks forth with a clear, calm eye upon all its bearings; meets opposition without the least show of perturbation, and cannot be thrown from his position; but stands unmoved amid opposition that would overwhelm many; and in his turn comes down upon his adversary with argument after argument, clothed in words that wither like the lightning.

This person must be a reformer, and should *lead* some Reform, as his peculiar character renders him bold to face *wrong*, and strong to defend his own faith. His power of endurance is also great; no trial discourages him; no design is too mighty for his dauntless spirit to undertake. He devotes soul and body to the cause which interests him, and the language of his heart is ever, "Never yield!" This character affects me more powerfully as I get more in sympathy with it.

As a writer, this person will use sarcasm and criticism, generally justly. He will never excel in the lighter literature; and is too earnest in his feelings for a poet, though he has a strong poetic nature, but cannot confine himself to measure, in expressing his ideas.

The religion of this man will belong to *his* mind alone. He will be governed by no creed, and acknowledge no form; yet the religious element in his nature is very large, though not so does the world understand him. He will be called "Infidel," most likely, by the Church.

He has no sympathy with any of the existing political parties, yet is deeply interested in all the political movements of the times, and watches carefully the national affairs. He will express himself in his own decided style upon the course of statesmen and others in office. He is more of a philanthropist than a patriot. He recognises little justice in the Administration of this country, and has no satisfaction in looking at the present political condition of other parts of the world.

The memory of this man is remarkable; he can recall facts, dates and circumstances that have the slightest relation to a subject in which he feels interest; and has the happy faculty of making these dates and facts tell most wonderfully. He is always convinced of the truth of his position before he expresses his opinions. He is pertinent in quotation, and often kills an enemy with his own shot.

This man has universal love; consequently his benevolence is very full. He embraces the Universe in his arms of love. He has full self-esteem, and a mountain of firmness. He feels *able* to do his duty, and he *will* do it, though Heaven, Earth, and Hell oppose.

I should think this person would consider woman as the equal of man, and would be a "Woman's Rights" advocate. The love he has for woman is the love he has for all the race, both male and female. As a husband, he would be kind and loving, and find sweet peace and happiness in the house-companionship of a sympathizing woman. He is fond of pets, and also of children; would love his own, and would inspire love in them. He would govern his household by love and reason, and not by *fear* or mere force.

In all things this man has respect for the highest law of our *nature*. He thinks that man should govern *himself*. He is fond of business, and is strictly honest in all his transactions; is always careful to keep his accounts in good order. He is fond of money as a means, and would use much if he had it; only wants funds to start a thousand operations for the good of man. He has good economy, and generally keeps out of the debtors' list. He is fond of beauty in nature and art; has a love of order; and good calculation. He judges character well, though sometimes forgets the greater strength of his own, when passing judgment upon weaker ones. He will ever advocate the cause of the oppressed; and, I feel impressed to say, will, in the coming time, be more honoured than he is at present. His is a name that will live.

MUCH IN LITTLE.

Putnam's Magazine for August contains a portrait of Bayard Taylor in Oriental costume.

—— Rev. Dr. Plummer, formerly of Richmond, Va., and more recently of Baltimore, has accepted the Professorship of Theology in the Old School Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Pittsburgh. He is the man who, in 1835, hinted that Lynch law and a "warming at the fire" of mobocracy was good enough for the Abolitionists. How many negroes he claims as his property, we do not know, but there is not a more thorough-going clerical slavocrat in all the land. And yet he is deemed a fit teacher of theology among the Presbyterians!

—— How rarely do we find a clergyman a consistent Abolitionist! If a man of this profession ventures now and then to speak a bold word for freedom, in his own pulpit or elsewhere, ten to one he will make that word nugatory by affiliating with slaveholders or their apologists. We have a case in point. The Rev. A. L. Stone, Pastor of Park street Church, Boston, professes to be an Abolitionist of the Free Soil stamp, and on the last Fourth of July he delivered an oration before the Municipal authorities of that city which rejoiced the hearts of the friends of freedom everywhere. Notwithstanding all this, however, we see that he has invited to his pulpit that "gluttonous man and wine-bibber," and advocate of slavery and the lower law, the Rev. Dr. Bethune!

——A correspondent of the *Tribune*, writing from Lexington, Va., says that the Western portion of that State will not be unrepresented in the crowd of emigrants to Kansas. Hundreds, he says, will go from there next season, to help make Kansas a free State. The same writer incidentally remarks that *Western* Virginia "would like to see" the Old Dominion herself become a free State; whereupon the *Tribune* says:

"If Western Virginia really wants to be free, why don't she say so and act so? Why consent to be forever weighed down by slavery without making even a struggle for deliverance? And why, especially, does she send Members of Congress who vote solid to open Kansas and Nebraska to slavery, and are in every way the most supple instruments of the Slave power? Men, if men you are, why do n't you act as if you were so?"

——The Boston *Commonwealth* says that Phillips, Sampson & Co., of that city, are about to issue a new anti-slavery novel, entitled "Ida May." Having examined the proof-sheets, the *Commonwealth* says: "It is a gem of the first water. The author works out the delineation of southern slavery from actual residence on a plantation; so that it is no echo of 'Uncle Tom.' The habit of publishers, in announcing new books, of styling them 'equal' or 'superior' to Uncle Tom's Cabin has created a wise distrust of such boasts. There is no need of comparison in this instance; 'Ida May' is a fresh, original creation, and, as it relates to an entirely different state of society, is not in any way borrowed from Mrs. Stowe. The publication of the book is only delayed until its issue in England. We predict that it will instantly arrest the attention of the whole reading public, both in America and Great Britain."

——CASSIUS M. CLAY has been doing a good work through Illinois, and at a few points (we wish they had been many) in Iowa. He has everywhere won the attention and made the impression due to his honesty, his frankness, courage and devotion to liberty. At Springfield, Ill., the Douglasites refused to let him speak in the State-House, but they did not succeed in silencing him. The *Quincy Tribune* closes its account of his speaking to a crowded house in that place as follows:

"Mr. Clay has left a deep impression in the minds of the people of this vicinity, in regard to the aggressions of the slave power, and we are satisfied the feeling of our citizens will manifest itself to good advantage when the time comes for action. Mr. Clay has proved himself one of nature's noblemen, a manly and honest man; true to the cause of freedom and firm when the boldest faltered. Unterrified by menace or resistance, he has maintained his stand as the champion of freedom and free speech in the very midst of the 'peculiar institution,' and 'old Kentucky, God bless her,' now stands forth as the only slave State that permits freedom of speech on this subject. We admire the full-souled, open-spoken and fearless man. Would to heaven we had more such men. Let us have them either for friend or foe, far more than the sneak who advocates the cause of slavery under the mask of freedom, and who has not the courage to call things by their right names."

—— The present scarcity of money and the sudden bursting of so many financial bubbles has led to some discussion in the newspapers of the extravagant expenditures of many "fashionable ladies" of the present day for articles wherewith to adorn their persons. "Minnie Myrtle," a favourite writer with a large class of people, deals very plainly with the subject in a letter from Saratoga to the *Times*. She says:

"I have asked a thousand times, where does the money come from that pays for all these things? You and your correspondent say, they are not paid for at all, in a multitude of instances; and the ladies are shining, not in borrowed, but in stolen feathers. It is a pity, and pity 'tis, 'tis true. In this case it is the merchants and manufacturers who suffer, I suppose; but if there is no market for laces and muslins and cambrics, what is to become of all the poor women who earn their bread—and a scanty pittance it is too—by embroidering them? By inquiring I have learned that from two to five cents a day is all that is paid those who

'Stitch, stitch, stitch,
'Till their eyes are weary and dim,'

in elaborating the rich patterns upon their borders! It is a question which political economists have tried in vain to settle, so I might as well let it alone. But it does not require the wisdom of a sage political economist to decide that it is not the duty of a family whose income is a thousand dollars a year to spend two thousand to encourage manufacturers, or merchants, or poor women.

"It is evident the world is all wrong some way, and I have not the vanity to think it will get righted by my efforts; but I have seen, as well as your correspondent, some of the behind-the-curtain scenes, where taste and elegance and show were all that were visible in front, and repining, discomfort and wretchedness, the every-day experience in the shade. What would your grandmothers have said to a modern lady's wardrobe? There is one whose husband's income is perhaps two thousand a year, certainly not more. Her morning dress cost twenty dollars; her embroidered skirt, without which it cannot be worn, was fifteen or twenty, and the laces to match as many more.

"She has some eight or ten evening dresses, each of which cost from fifteen to thirty dollars; the embroideries to match are, at the lowest, two or three hundred. Her husband allows her twenty-five pairs of gloves and twenty-five pairs of gaiters a year, but these, she says, *do not begin to last her*. She would not be seen in a hat that cost less than ten or fifteen dollars, and she requires six in the course of a year. All these dresses will be out of fashion next year, and she will need a whole new set *to be decent*. No mantilla is fit to wear that does not cost twenty-five dollars, and next season it will not be fit to wear any way. Shawls are in proportion, but the articles which are never visible are of the most economical kind and quality! She declares that all this extravagance is to please her husband; he likes to see her well dressed, and would be willing she should spend more. Their drawing-rooms are magnificent, and their table rich when guests are present, but there is not only economy, but meanness, in the kitchen and garret. The lace stores in Saratoga are a marvel. A gentleman, who keeps a furnishing store for gentlemen, says he does no business at all; gentlemen do not care what they wear—anything will do. A man will buy a four shilling hat for himself and a five dollar head-dress for his wife. She must have it—there is no alternative at all. Gentlemen do not *talk about* one another if their hats are not the most expensive, and their coats are not the newest fashion in the market. But the jewelry and lace stores moved here on purpose to accommodate visitors number a dozen or more, and they are literally crowded from morning till night. I cannot say that those who buy are not abundantly able, but it must be a deep mine out of which the money is coined that pays a fashionable party's Saratoga bill."

POLITICS.

One Gen. Greathouse, of Evansville, Ind., having failed in securing a nomination for the Legislature on the ticket of his party (Hunker Dem.), undertook to expose the defects of the party machinery. He gives us this glimpse of the means sometimes resorted to to obtain a nomination:

"We will suppose there is to be a convention held at this or that place, as the case may be. Before the time of holding that Convention I go and see the leading politicians of the different townships, and say, 'Sir, I want you to be a delegate to the Congressional Convention and have the right kind of men appointed from this township.' I present him with *five dollars*; that amount will pay his expenses to the Convention and back again; at the same time I hand him three dollars, which will hire his corn ploughed over while he is absent. *Now*," said the General, "it would not be necessary to ask that man to use his influence for me, for, *by G—! he would do it anyhow*."

—— The *Independent*, while it has no confidence in present political parties, as such, thinks that a *new* party is neither feasible nor desirable. It suggests that "the desired concentration of feeling on behalf of freedom" can be attained, without party organization, by means of a PLEDGE, "which, without of necessity detaching any man from his party, shall yet secure his whole influence, whether in that party or out of it, for the cause of Freedom." The knowledge of such a pledge will, it thinks, bring forth candidates of the right sort. It will have the ubiquitous power of the "Know-Nothings," without their dangerous vice of secresy. It suggests the following as a suitable form for such a pledge, and says, "let it be circulated in every neighbourhood; let the dicta of party conventions be ignored, and the voice of the people utter itself with a spontaneous and irresistible majesty."

"I hereby pledge myself to vote for no candidate for any office, whether State, County, City, or Town, who will not formally refuse to assist in any manner in the rendition of fugitives from service under the Fugitive Slave Law; and to vote for no candidate for Congress who will not pledge himself to oppose the admission of any new slave State into the Union, and to do all in his power for the repeal of any and all acts of Congress that recognise, extend, protect or perpetuate the institution of slavery."

—— The Free Soil papers of Pennsylvania are not satisfied with Judge Pollock's position, nor with the Address of the Whig State Committee, from which we gave extracts last week. Mrs. Swisshelm says:

"It is the Philadelphia cotton-ocracy which has dictated this tame address, and will our western farmers give up their publicly expressed principles to secure Southern trade to Philadelphia, or will they stand by freedom and their own convictions of right, and let our merchant princes take care of their own trade?

"The majority of the people are in favour of a platform like that of the Allegheny Co. Whigs; and had Judge Pollock the manliness to take this stand, he would be elected by an overwhelming majority. As it is, he may be elected, for the people are so desirous to avenge the Nebraska swindle that they will concede a good deal. Why do not these people meet and concert ways to maintain their own principles? Why should men be bound by the action of State Committees? Let every man do his own thinking; let the people have a mass convention and bring this canny committee to a waking sense of the present whereabouts of the moral world.

"The Wilmot Convention is the only hope we can now see. Let the people go there, and see if they cannot find candidates who will take a platform like that of the Allegheny County Whigs—the Connecticut and Ohio Whigs, and all honest men of the Free States. Something must be done *now*; for if these scheming politicians get leave to direct the current of popular indignation sideways, they will destroy its force, and finally carry it into a canal to be dammed up and let out at pleasure to turn slavery's mill and grind the faces of the poor.

"This State Committee intend holding fast by their union with Southern Whigs, and, if let alone, will re-affirm the Baltimore Platform next year. Have an eye on them, ye men who do the voting, and try if you cannot build a platform for your own ballot box."

SUNDAY IN PHILADELPHIA.

SUNDAY, until lately, has been the great day in Philadelphia for riots, drunkenness and firemen's fights. On the accession of Judge Conrad to the Mayoralty, however, the excesses usual on that day were to a great extent arrested by the zeal of that officer and the vigilance of his police in enforcing the law. The Mayor had every tavern-keeper, or other person who sold liquor on Sunday, arrested and brought before him to answer for the offence of violating the law by which he held his license. One of the fellows appealed to the Supreme Court of the State, and that body—Judges Woodward, Lewis and Knox on the bench—decided that vending liquor on Sunday was not a violation of License Act, but only an offence against the act of 1794, which forbids, under the trifling penalty of $4, all worldly employment on the Sabbath Day. This decision was hailed with immense delight by the keepers of the groggeries and their customers, and it was expected that the next Sunday (the Sunday just passed) would witness a renewal of the orgies and disorders which, for awhile, had been so happily checked. But on Saturday last Mayor Conrad came out with a proclamation to the public, declaring his purpose to continue in the course in which he had begun, and showing that, despite the decision of the Supreme Court, he had law enough to sustain him in inflicting upon Sabbath rum-venders the severest penalties. Whether it was in consequence of this proclamation or from other motives, it does not appear, but last Sunday was quite a quiet day in Philadelphia; only a few taverns, and those generally of the lowest kind, opened their bars. The keepers of these were arrested, and the next day held to bail to answer for their conduct before the Criminal Court.

The decision of the Supreme Court, we understand, has given rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction among the respectable people of Philadelphia and of the State generally, and is leading to an excited discussion among all classes, the result of which cannot but be favourable to the cause of Temperance. If the decision of the Court should be sustained, it will lead to a demand for a stringent Prohibitory law, which will be so general and imperative as to admit of no refusal. Such, at least, is the opinion of well informed Philadelphians.

HON. GREENE C. BRONSON is said to have lost nearly all his property by the failure of the Empire Stone Dressing Company. That is a severe calamity, but it is not half as bad as the sacrifice of moral principle made by the same man in identifying himself, as he has done, with the Slavocracy of the South. Poverty, especially in one's old age, is no small evil; but, in comparison with a sullied character, it is not worth a thought.

CHAS. P. SHIRAS, author of the familiar rhyme,

"Dimes and dollars, dollars and dimes,
An empty pocket's the worst of crimes,"

and of various other poems, extensively published in the newspapers, died a few days since, in Allegheny City, Pa.

Domestic Correspondence.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CLII.

THE ARGUMENT.—The Correspondent at Newport—His explanath and exulteth himself—His exulteth over the editors—His complaineth of Summer—And why—He describeth Commencement and bemoaneth himself—He glorieth Governor Washburn and the Lancers—And telleth how Peace was preserved—Also of what he saw—Skill of a Lancer in use of his weapon—The Renditions of Washburn and of Burns—The Correspondent justifieth the Governor and is exegetical on Constitutional Law—Meeting of Alumni—Mr. Felton's Oration—His defect of character—The Correspondent offereth a bet—How he would have gained it—Heavy Gift Books—Malignant suggestions—The Worcester Meeting—Fusion and Confusion—Necessity of Whig Destruction—The Correspondent hopeth much from the Know-Nothings, &c. &c. &c.

NEWPORT, July 30, 1854.

You will perceive that I have taken a new point for the departure of this Epistle. I trust you and your readers will excuse my leaving my appointed post of observation for a day or two, in consideration of the inflexible resolution with which I maintain it during the chief of the year. Summer and winter, seed-time and harvest, find me engaged in seeking out Boston happenings for the edification and growth in grace of your readers and their remote posterity. This incessant application of mind and continual confinement to the limits of a City

"Where houses thick and sewers annoy the air,"

might in time unfavourably affect the prospects of humanity and the fate of the Coming Man (if he is ever coming), by curtailing the instructive lessons it is the Mission of these letters to convey, if I were not allowed an occasional escape into the country or to the sea-side. This is the sole reason of my finding myself where I am. And it is by no means a bad place to be in, neither. Nothing can well exceed the beauty of the scene that I have only to lift my eyes to behold. Fields, green as English fields are (or ought to be, for these are just of the right shade), rocks, the sea gently breaking against them and the foam creaming lazily over them, the near harbour and the illimitable expanse beyond sprinkled with white sails gliding softly in all imaginable directions, make up a lovely picture. And then the temperature! Aha, it is delicious to think how you fellows in New York are roasting, broiling and frying, at this very writing!

Let us see what I have to tell you. You know that summer is very bad for gossip, whatever it may be for potatoes, so you must be content to take whatever I have a mind to give you. And if you don't like it, you may *lump* it. To be sure, Commencement has happened since I wrote last. But that Feast, which was once the great Feast of the year, or if excelled in dignity, only by the Governor's Election, has been sadly shorn of its beams of late years. By dint of changing the day of its celebration from the end of August to the middle of July, the College Authorities have succeeded in destroying the old brilliancy of the occasion as well as they could desire, if such were their purpose. All Boston—that is, all Boston that is of any account—is away at sea-sides or watering places, or at country-seats, and there are no strangers arrived as yet to take its place. However, we had the Governor there. Yea, verily, and the gallant company of Lancers, to protect him from all assaults of his enemies. The last time I had seen these brave fellows was on the glorious day when they assisted at the saving of the Union from the parricidal hands of Anthony Burns. Having succeeded in carrying that traitor out of the City in one direction, it was gratifying to know that they had been equally successful in carrying His Excellency out of it in the other. They preserved the peace of the City in a manner that must have rejoiced the cockles of Mayor Smith's heart. There was not even the slightest attempt at rescuing the Governor out of their hands, and he was delivered up to the Authorities at Cambridge without the smallest breach of Law and Order. Perhaps strict historical accuracy should compel me (however reluctantly) to say that I *did* see one of these gallant fellows kick his next neighbour for grasping too fondly and too long a deadly weapon, in the use of which this accomplished Corps appeared to be signally expert. It may not be improper to add, that the weapon in question was a pocket-pistol, and that it was charged only with brandy.

With the exception of this slight breach of discipline (which, surely, the strictest martinet could not find it in his heart to censure, under the circumstances), the Rendition of Emory Washburn was effected without bloodshed and with the most gratifying decorum. I am not informed whether this Escort of Mr. Washburn had the zest of being contrary to the laws of the land, as was that tendered to Mr. Burns. But as His Excellency was pleased to express his approbation of the conduct of the troops in the latter case, the law to the contrary notwithstanding, it is to be supposed he would have been equally liberal in his views as to the former, under the same circumstances. And, indeed, as Governor Washburn was a Judge long before Judge Hoar (an elder, if not a better, lawyer), his practical exposition of the law must be accepted as the more authentic of the two. Of course, there ought to be no law—indeed, there can be none—of Massachusetts that should give any Virginia gentleman, like Col. Suttle, any trouble in catching his nigger. Governor Washburn was entirely in the right. None of those old-fashioned botherations, the Writ of Habeas Corpus, *de Homine replegiando*, and all the rest of 'em, have anything to do with the matter. This Glorious Union was formed for the single purpose of qualifying all of us to catch our masters' niggers. Any law that contravenes this, the Chief End of Man, is of necessity void and of no effect. The moment a slave-catcher touches the soil of Massachusetts, the Higher Law of Slavery attaches, and all the inferior prescriptions and statutes of the conquered province disappear. Of course, there can be no obligation on the Governor of the State either to forbid the Militia, of which he is Commander-in-Chief, from acting as the Slave-catcher's Guard, or to order it to act as the *posse* of the Sheriff to serve the Process of the State. It is a well-known maxim, "*inter arma, silent leges.*" In time of war there is no law. Now, as Slavery is a state of War with all Mankind, and as what are pleasantly styled the *Free* States are merely conquered provinces, their own local bye-laws can have no just effect when one of the dominant race chooses to enforce the Supreme Law of the Conquerors. For my part, I stand by Governor Washburn.

The next day after Commencement was held the Meeting of the Society of Alumni, which took the place of that of the Phi Beta Kappa, and which it is to be hoped, for reasons the curious can find by referring to former letters of mine, will soon supersede it altogether. A large number of Graduates were in attendance, and an able Oration was pronounced before them by Professor Felton. This excellent and genial gentleman has one defect in his character—which, to be sure, is *a thumper*. He is one of the Literary Executors of the late lamented Webster! But this circumstance enabled me to display that acumen and knowledge of character for which I am justly celebrated. Just before he opened, I offered a moderate bet to my next neighbour that he would not get through without a praise-offering to the Godlike. My neighbour scouted the idea, but declined the bet—he not being, like myself, a sporting character. As the Orator drew towards the end of his paper, I trembled for my reputation. But at last I saw in the distance the Coming Man. I watched his approach with increasing delight, and when, at length, Mr. Webster arrived by the way of Athens, riding *pick-a-back* on Mr. Demosthenes, and was set down at the foot of Bunker Hill Monument, my exultation knew no bounds. I never enjoyed a compliment to Mr. Webster, not even those I have bestowed on him myself, with a more exquisite relish. The Oration was a very excellent one, and the only thing I would have had omitted was a very unnecessary apology for Dickens and Lord Shaftesbury for their Anti-Slavery misdeeds—which, at least in the case of the noble lord, were of no unpardonable atrocity. The Society dined together afterwards, and had a very good time generally. And, by the way, *apropos* to Mr. Webster's Literary Executors, I see that, at the School Examinations here, lately, no less than three masters were complimented by their grateful pupils with copies of the ponderous works of that ill-used man. I could not help thinking that the young rogues had a malicious memory of some magisterial malfeasances of the beneficiaries, and aimed these heavy missiles at their heads as a slight acknowledgment of the same; though it has been malignantly suggested that, possibly, this might have been a device of the booksellers to bring this lumber of theirs into notice again, and, at any rate, to get rid of three sets.

On the same day that the Alumni Meeting was celebrated, the Anti-Nebraska, or Fusion, Meeting was held at Worcester. I was torn by conflicting emotions as to which of the two I should go. I chose the duty nearest to me, as you have seen. There were hopes that the Fusion Meeting might turn out a *Confusion* Meeting, which was the reason of my hesitation. It was thought that the Whigs might send up a large body of troops and take possession of the Convention, and, resolving over again that they were the only true and sufficient Anti-Slavery Party, settle things in their own way. In such case, to use a Yankee phrase, "there would have been *music*"—which "music" I should have been entirely ready to face. But it did not turn out so. It was not much more than a Free Soil Convention, with a Whig President, and a large infusion of new Whig and Democratic members. The Whig leaders are resolved to maintain their separate organization, and will do all in their power to destroy any antagonist party. The Whigs are, as Mr. Keyes set forth at that Meeting, the greatest enemies of any Anti-Slavery political movement; for, with professions of strong Anti-Slavery feeling and of the duty of doing something to check Slavery, and with a real feeling of the kind on the part of many of the rank and file, yet the moment any of their party attempt to do anything, they set their heels upon them and crush them, if they can. They cannot give up their hope of Slaveholding assistance in getting into the White House, the next day after Never. The truth is, the Whigs must be broken in pieces and ground to powder, before any effective Anti-Slavery political party can be organized. Out of the small pieces and the fine dust some good building material may be found. This good service, I am happy to hear, the Know-Nothings are likely to do for them. It is said that this modest party, who acknowledge that ignorance which others vainly attempt to conceal, will put the Whigs of this State into the most hopeless of vocative cases, and that when the question is asked, after Election, "where are the Whigs?" Echo will answer, "Nowhere!" I know nothing, and care less, about what it is the Know-Nothings don't know; but I do know that anything that demolishes either or both of the old parties does a good thing. There can be no New Heaven and New Earth until the Old have been utterly destroyed with a fervent heat. D. Y.

THE CHURCH.

THE Cincinnati *Christian Press* recently discoursed thus of the duty and the power of the Church:

"In our deliberate judgment, one thing only can avert the complete triumph of the slave power; and that is the planting of the Church of Christ right across the line of its march. If this cannot be done, our solemn conviction is that the country may be reckoned as lost. There is but one power in this land mightier than slavery, and that is the Church. The Church, alone, has power to draw out, bind and slay this Leviathan. She can do it without violence, or bloodshed, or dissolution of the Union. The foul institution can no more withstand the *action* of the Church than the demons could resist the voice of Jesus. All else has been tried, and has signally failed. Political action, or remonstrance, has availed little or nothing, and will avail nothing in time to come, except it comes, as the fruit of deep, wide spread, religious convictions.

"The protest of the Church, dissevered from any fitting action, will be as the idle winds that blow around the Capitol. But once let the Church of God step forth with decided, earnest purpose and declare slaveholding a sin against God, separate herself from it as a thing accursed and abhorred, and, speaking, as she has a right to do, in the Almighty's name, let her forbid it forever to come within the pale of the Church; let her refuse it the Christian name, character and communion, and earth and hell combined cannot save Slavery from death. Thus only will it, or can it be slain."

There is a vital error in talk like this. It is in the assumption that the *American* Church is the "Church *of Christ*"—"the Church *of God*"—when its guilty connivance with Slavery proves it to be a synagogue of Satan. The Church of Christ (not all the combinations that call themselves by his name) is now and always has been "planted right across the line" of slavery's devastating march. That Church has its ear ever open to the cry of the oppressed, a hand ready to help them. It is composed, not of those whose only bond of union is a man-ordained creed and who cry 'Lord, Lord,' while they enslave those for whom He lived and died, but of those who have the spirit of Christ, and who, like Him, seek to deliver the captive and to open the prison to them that are bound. This is a "hard saying," we know, but it is nevertheless true. It is little better than blasphemy to speak of the American Church—a Church which, for more than half a century, has prostituted itself to the service of slavery—as the representative of Christ, the Prince of Emancipators. For saying this we are mocked at by that Church as infidels, and the *Christian Press* has been so infatuated as sometimes to join in the denunciation. We hope it may live to repent of its error.

TO THE FREE DEMOCRATS OF PENNSYLVANIA.—We cheerfully comply with the request to copy the following address, and hope it may have the desired effect.

It is well known to you that, some weeks since, I issued and distributed to you a Prospectus for a Free Democratic newspaper, to be published at Harrisburg. I had hoped, ere this, to have issued the first number of the paper; but the prospect of the success of the experiment has not been commensurate with my expectations. Thus far, the number of subscribers obtained is less than a hundred; and unless at least one thousand subscribers are obtained, the paper cannot be established. To start it, would be prejudicial, not only to the cause, but to myself. Can this number be obtained? I think so, if you will co-operate with me in urging the support of the paper upon the people. I know it is said that our friends are few and scattered. It is true, but our strength is in the life and potency of our principles, and the way to increase the number of our friends is to disseminate a knowledge of our principles. This is the aim and purpose of the *Free Citizen*. Will you sustain it? The returns of the Presidential election of 1852 show that Mr. Hale received 8,860 votes in the State. Let each one of these voters try to do something to sustain an independent paper at Harrisburg, and the paper will be established on a permanent basis. May I expect your active co-operation?

I would be glad to visit each precinct in the State, and take each one of you by the hand, but I cannot leave my business here, nor can I spare the money which such a visit would require. If each one of you will do what he can for the *Free Citizen*, such a visit will be unnecessary. Let each one try to do something for a paper whose aim will be to elevate man, socially, morally, politically.

Should the paper not be established, those who have forwarded money for subscriptions may expect to have it returned.

Those who are willing to aid in the work will please address me at this city, Box 821, till 1st of September. A. M. GANGEWER.

Washington, D. C., July 24, 1854.

THE OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN, affirming the judgment of Judge Smith in relation to the Fugitive Slave act, will be found on the first page. It will, we doubt not, command the assent not only of the great mass of the people, but of the better class of the legal profession. To what extent the decision will enure to the direct advantage of fugitive slaves and their friends, time only can tell. We hope its influence as a precedent may be felt in the Courts of other States, and that it will prove to be the first of a series of decisions that will precede and herald the emancipation of the Northern people from the Judicial control of the Slave Power.

As we stated last week, Mr. Booth, after the promulgation of this decision, was again arrested, not, as before, by authority of a Commissioner, but upon a warrant from the Judge of the District Court—a warrant predicated upon a pending indictment and making no allusion whatever to the Fugitive law. Mr. Booth's application for a second *habeas corpus* was, as we suspected it would be, denied by the Supreme Court of the State, there being nothing upon the record to bring the case within the principles laid down in their previous decision.

MEETINGS IN PHILADELPHIA.

THERE is to be a Temperance Meeting at Marlborough, Chester County, on the 19th inst., at which B. Rush Plumly, of Philadelphia, and others are to be in attendance.

It is in contemplation also to hold a Grand Anti-Slavery Meeting at the same place immediately on the rising of, or the next day after, the Temperance Meeting, at which James and Lucretia Mott, Robert Purvis and J. Miller McKim, and others from Philadelphia may be expected to be present.

There is to be a Lyceum Meeting on Saturday, the 12th inst., in John Jackson's Woods, near Avondale; and on the next day (Sunday) there will be preaching in the same place, by the Rev. Dr. Furness, if that gentleman will accept, as there is reason to believe he will, an invitation that has been extended to him to that effect.

SAMUEL LEWIS, for many years a leading Abolitionist at the West, is dead. He was a man of excellent character, fine abilities and indomitable courage and perseverance. Perhaps there is no other man among the whole body of political Abolitionists west of the Alleghanies to whose eloquence and devotedness the anti-slavery cause is more deeply indebted. As he has been severely ill for a long time, his death will take no one by surprise; but there are many who will drop a tear of sadness as they read the announcement of his departure to a higher sphere.

JUDGE GRIER.—We alluded last week to the fact that certain charges, affecting the judicial integrity of Judge Grier, had been brought to the notice of Congress. We have since learned that the charges referred to relate solely to his conduct in respect to the Wire Suspension Bridge at Wheeling. There is a strong opposition to the Bridge in Pittsburgh, and Judge Grier is charged with abusing his judicial functions to favour his own private and partisan views as a citizen of that place. The memorial against him is from the proprietors of the Bridge. We doubt if any thing very serious will grow out of it

Summary.

CALIFORNIA LIGHTNING.—The *Sierra Citizen* says that during a recent thunder storm a lone pine on the brow of the hill, south of town, was struck by lightning, setting the top in a blaze, which continued to burn all night. After nightfall the spectacle was beautiful, and every passer-by stopped to gaze at it. The trunk was hid in the darkness, but the burning top seemed like a great lamp hung in the heavens to make darkness visible.

SINGULAR STOCK.—Robert Scott, Esq., of Woodford County, Kentucky, who owns one of the splendid farms of that region, has a large pond of water upon his domain, by which he has half domesticated a large flock of wild geese. He first procured eleven and cropped their wings, which reclaimed them for the season. They migrate northward in the Spring, and return in the Fall with their full-fledged young. The flock now numbers two hundred and eighty, and it increases annually.

QUEER PLACE FOR A TOAD.—One of the operators of the House telegraph informs us, that while repairing the telegraph wires at Fairfield, a few days since, a live full-grown toad was found under the glass insulator, on the top of a pole, which was a chestnut, perfectly smooth, twenty-five feet high, and not near any tree or building. How his toadship got there, or how long he had occupied his aerial but precarious position, is a matter for curious speculation.—*Boston Courier.*

OUTRAGEOUS ABANDONMENT OF THE U. S. MAIL.—We have information from undoubted authority that the mail carriers to Utah are accustomed to throw away much of the paper mail after getting away up the Platte, and that there were a number of bags thrown away or abandoned, or thrown into a cave just above Fort Kearney, and in other places along the route. Is Government paying men for destroying the mail this way? It might be done cheaper at Independence before starting.—*Council Bluff Bugle.*

PREPARING THE WAY.—Something has been said in the papers about electing Fred. Douglass (if we should say Frederick, the doughfaces wouldn't know whom we meant) to Congress. We see that he is getting in the line of safe precedents. On the 12th inst., he delivered the address before the literary societies of the Western-Reserve College, and the effort would not disparage the Saxon blood of the white folks down South. The address is printed, and would occupy some eight columns of our paper. There is no telling what may take place yet.—*Syracuse Chronicle.*

FILLIBUSTER EXCITEMENT IN KENTUCKY.—There is a great deal of unnecessary excitement prevailing in certain sections of this State, caused by the enrollment of a number of young men as volunteers in the proposed Cuban expedition. In Lexington, certain parties have gone so far as to cause the arrest of Messrs. R. M. Johnson and John Haldeman, two gentlemen of that city, who are charged with being actively engaged in the enlistment of troops. In this city it is well known that a Company has been organized, and in the towns of Hopkinsville, Bowling Green, &c., the same thing has been done. The chief field officer of the Kentucky regiment was stopping at one of our leading hotels for some days last week.—*Louisville Courier.*

THE BRAND OF CAIN.—The editor of the Philadelphia *Courier* says: While at the "Burning Springs," near Niagara, a few days ago, we were requested to enter the names of our party in the Visitor's Register, and while complying, we observed that the registry had been suspended at about two-thirds down on the left hand page, and then continued

Miscellaneous Department.

WENDELL PHILLIPS AT UNION COLLEGE.

On Monday evening, July 24, the Adelphic and Philomathean Societies of Union College celebrated their Anniversary in the Dutch Reformed Church, Schenectady. The orator of the occasion was WENDELL PHILLIPS, Esq., of Boston, whose address was reported in the New York *Times* as follows:

Mr. PHILLIPS thanked his audience for the generous judgment and liberal spirit which had impelled the Societies to invite one to address them who was probably only known to them as the advocate of opinions which were, to use the mildest term, distasteful. Every one of your voices, gentlemen (he added), goes to make up that mass of public opinion upon which we depend, and our children. You stand at the parting of two roads. You stand where the roads separate; where practical life begins. You do not appreciate it now. A few years hence, you will appreciate it; will understand how those who are in the thick of the battle will gladly seize an opportunity, as I do to-night, to lay a hand upon the full-freighted vessel before it is launched. I would endeavour to point out to you briefly, the responsibility that hangs upon thoughtful men in a Republic. I say thoughtful men, because I prefer that term to the plural, the educated classes. For, gentlemen, we have no really educated classes. It is not the University alone that educates our great men. As many graduate from the newspaper offices as from the Universities. The New York *Tribune* is a University.

I would endeavour to draw lines still finer, if possible. Our lot is cast in a different land from those who surround us. Recognise for a moment the peculiar characteristics of our own time. Our country has been compared with Greece. But Greece was but a tyranny. She gave us only a graceful language, that the Bible, when it came, might not stammer in a barbarous idiom [applause]. Aristides and Socrates, and the other great names that we love, held the tenure of their lives only at the bidding of a mob.

Even Rome had no individual liberty; and Providence seems to have raised her up that her triumphal car might smoothe a pathway for the naked foot of the Gospel. She never crumbled up her masses into individuals. She grouped them into States. Strangely enough, gentlemen, it is in the Feudal system that we find the only germ of real independence. Before this element of feudalism had impregnated modern society, there was little besides a servile spirit of dependence. The motto of Venice was, "First Venetian; then Christian." So the Roman: "First a Roman, then a Man." We owe to Christianity itself the idea of Democracy. Neither in Greek, nor in Latin, nor in Aristotle, nor in the philosophy of Seneca, can you find a trace of that Civilization which characterizes the Nineteenth Century. Representative Government is borrowed from the machinery of Christian Councils. In old times, men were governed by force—the force of delusion, the force of arms. The soldier, thank God, has had his day; the priest is stalking into obscurity. We are a race of thought. We are a reading people. The epoch of law, the government of *ideas*, gentlemen—this is ours. We do not live under a government of *law*. It is idle to say that we do this. It is the sovereignty of thoughtful minds that governs us. We are governed by public opinion. We are more under the government of newspapers than under that of law. We are under a government of ideas. In Europe, it is comparatively safe for the scholar to say and act as he pleases. He is under no necessity of consulting public opinion. Hence the difference between us and them.

Justice and truth are the interest of everybody. The selfishness of to-morrow shall neutralize the selfishness of to-day. I have seen the weeds growing upon the Palace of the Cæsars, and have seen the granite masses that were parted by the tiny plants which we trod contemptuously under our feet. So with ideas. They roll on, and their number makes them great:

> "Thus and thus we run,
> And ever Truth comes uppermost,
> And ever is justice done."

What, then, is the duty of thoughtful men? It is *the extremity of individual independence of thought*. Only in fidelity to conscience can the experiment of American Liberty find its ultimate success.

Let us look for a moment at ourselves, and what we call Institutions. Perhaps the greatest of our business classes is the Mercantile. The money power chiefly forms our public opinion. It controls our sentiments, shapes our destinies, and is in fact our ruling power. A remark borrowed from old Dr. Johnson was not so misplaced, after all. "If," said he, "you place a dollar on one side of hell, and an American on the other, he will clutch the dollar, even if he be in danger of falling in." We know very well that the moneyed classes care only for peace. They live only in the present. They love to see the sails of their ships well filled by prosperous breezes. They love the halcyon days upon the quiet waves. They hate wars. They are careless whether the Cross or the Crescent gain the victory; careless whether civilization advances or retires.

Then we come to the Press. The Press is the next great moulder of public opinion. Is it independent? There are some presses that are so, but not all. It is one of the most melancholy features in the history of our country that the Press, as a general rule, is not independent. I conceive that the position occupied among us by the conductor of the public press, is one of a peculiar nature and of great responsibility. Opinions on national affairs, the guidance of opinion on disputed points, are expected from the man who stands at the helm of the newspaper. To him, the public look for information. He interchanges thought with his brethren of the European Press, and events on both sides of the ocean receive the colouring through this channel of intercommunication.

In speaking of the Press of the country, Mr. Phillips made a desperate sally against the Harpers. I quote his language: As an American, I blush for the fame of the American Press, when I reflect upon its subserviency. If I take for an example the best and most princely of American Publishing-houses (that of the Messrs. Harper), who count their wealth by millions, and rightly so, it appears that before they will give us the Thought of the Old World, they expurgate it. They will not permit the son of Wilberforce, from the See of Oxford, to speak of the American Church and its Slavery; nor Dean Paley to treat of Moral Philosophy; nor Howard Hinton to tell of History; nor Mary Howitt to write novels—except they expurgate it. And if we turn to the Religious Press, we find that a great publishing establishment (I refer to the American Sunday School Union), backed up by all the piety of the thirty States, and by the strong religious support of the whole people, when it once, by accident, happened to publish an Anti-slavery tract, called it back, when remonstrances came in—instead of saying, what would have been the truth: "gentlemen, this book was published 20 years ago, and was not intended to have any bearing on your case; but in the Providence of God it has found you, and may it do you good" [laughter]. They broke their stereotype plates, and like the punished school-boy, promised "never to do so any more." Or, take the princes of your own State—your Paulding, who when he descended to be Secretary of the Navy, suppressed and prunned the chapters of his works. Or, turn to Bancroft of my own State, who wrote the first volume of his History under the shadow of the woods of Northampton, where Edwards meditated and laid the cornerstone of American Literature—even he, when he was whirled into the maelstrom of public life with the glittering baubles of office flashing before his eyes, could mould a chapter to suit his new latitude. It was like an old "New-England Almanac," suitable "for Washington and the neighbouring towns." No! it is not a Press so servile as this that we can trust.

There is another feature of American life. It is *Politics*. But can we find back-bones in our politicians? Politics always puts a man in fetters. Lord John Russell once said that the nature of politics most resembled that of snakes: it is the tail that moves the head [laughter]. The pursuit of politics is only the subserviency of a great intellect to the average of his party. An old Latin writer—a wag—says in the well known passage,

> "Politicus est quis, &c."

"A politician is what?"—that he is "a man who serves God just so far as not to offend the Devil" [laughter]. Or, as Carlyle expresses the idea better, he saw "a man ever rushing into the thickest of the crowd, with a flaunting banner in his hand and shouting the war cry; but I saw that as he cried he kept one eye over his shoulder, and that when the crowd stopped shouting he stopped too." Not in such men is to be found the faculty which we can trust to guide the ship of State.

Let us look at the *Church*. I am aware that in trenching upon this ground, I am but treading on ashes which conceal a flaming fire. It is the tenderest point in our American life. Yet it should not be passed lightly by, It is our duty to stand on the watch-tower, to analyze and to criticise our institutions. It is a fearful experiment when we try to be all sovereigns and princes. In the Holy Land none but sainted hands might touch the Ark. With us, every hand is outstretched to uphold it. See to it, men of thought, that in this new phase of human life, you be not wanting in your duty. Did you ever see the woodman as he goes to the wood, when the trees are bent with heavy loads of snow, how he takes, first one lithe limb, and then another, and shakes from it the burden that weighs it down; and how the branches, thus made free, what I would do. And, again, if a tree is found by that woodman so crushed beneath its load that it bends too closely to the ground to recover itself, he cuts it down. Does he cut it down because he does not like the tree? No. But because it is more healthy to cut away what is too weak to be good. Now, our Church, being human, shares the imperfections of everything that is human. The Catholic Church is servile; the Episcopalian is aristocratic. And who creates *our* Pulpit? *The Pews* [laughter]. And as the Catholic Church represents the Pope, and the English the aristocracy, so the tendency of our church is to represent *the pews*. Be it understood that I speak now of tendencies. He is a hard critic who expects of the Pulpit to stem the popular current. Let him beware who lays upon the American clergyman a task which he himself will not undertake. The wearing of a black coat makes no man worse; and not always does it make him better.

Such are the great sources of public opinion in this country. Who shall plant the seed of that independent thought which must come in to perpetuate the results of the great experiment we are trying? It must come, gentlemen, from the individual independence of thoughtful men. But not trammelled by party; be not a fragment of a sect; bring everything human to the bar of your judgment, and receive nothing but what is good. Go not with the multitude to cry "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." Be ye certain, gentlemen, to falsify the old character of scholars, that of timeservers, and timid men. Remember, gentlemen, the saying of the Hindoo philosopher: "Single was I born; single shall I die; and single shall I go up to judgment." Throw away that American idea, that in the soul there is any number. Carry from these walls, if you carry nothing else, the self-respect of *doing your own thinking*. Trust to no future, however pleasant. Let the dead Past bury its dead—

> "The lives of great men all remind us
> That we may make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, may leave behind us,
> Footsteps on the sand of Time.
>
> "Let us, then, be up and doing,
> With a heart for any fate;
> Still achieving, still pursuing,
> Learn to labour and to wait."

THE THEOLOGICAL TEACHERS OF ANDOVER.

> "Hark! how blithe the throstle sings!
> He, too, is no mean preacher.
> Come forth into the light of things;
> Let nature be your teacher."—*Wordsworth.*

ANDOVER, July 6, 1854.

My Dear C.: Perhaps you think I am venturing on to dangerous ground in giving you an account of the theological teachers here whose discourses most affect my mind. Now-a-days one can scarcely pass an honest opinion on such subjects without tripping up somewhere. Snares, traps, and gins environ you; you are a Fatalist, Sabellian, a Unitarian, a Universalist, a Taster, an Exerciser, a Hopkinsian, an Emmonsite, all in so many breaths, and before you are yourself aware of being anything but a common-sense human being, thinking the most obvious of thoughts. And the way you get to be so is quite simple. If you hold *any* thing in common with any body; if you think or reason in *any* respect as some body else does, why then you are they, and all their prefixes, suffixes and affixes belong to you by right of possession. In this way, you can be made out on at least a dozen sides of any question at once.

For this reason I feel all the delicacy of beginning to speak of our theological teachers here at Andover; and as the department of Natural Theology is least open to controversy, I shall first take up our Professors in that department.

This department of Natural Theology, you are aware, is altogether the most ancient of any. It has, indeed, existed more or less from the very days when the "morning stars sang together." An old poet among the Hebrews says, "The heavens declare the glory of God;" and a sage somewhat later says, "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that He has made." Nay, we are referred by One higher to the teachings of natural theology: "Behold the fowls of the air. Consider the lillies of the field." "Now learn a parable of the fig-tree."

I may, therefore, be pardoned if, in my views of Andover, a place so redolent of theology of all kinds, I first give some prominent notice of its natural theologians.

And first, and in my view, most distinguished is Rev. Dr. Robert Lincoln, whose hilarity of disposition, and flow of easy cheerfulness, and sociability have made him a general favourite. Some very strait-laced people, not considering that vivacity of poetic and musical temperament which characterizes him, have complained of him as wanting in dignity; and adduced as evidence that even the very boys in the street feel free to call him "Bob-a-link," a liberty which a more suitable reserve of manner would effectually have prevented. But our friends might as well complain of a sweet briar-bush for not being a cathedral. Let it be given up and freely conceded that dignity of the sombre and clerical style is not Dr. Lincon's *forte*. God, who knew best what he wanted him for when he made him, never put a particle of it in him, and Dr. Lincon has the sense—very uncommon in this world—not to think that he knows better than his Maker. For this reason he does not try to make himself over into something quite different from what he was created to be.

Therefore, according to popular views, all his style of acting is eminently unclerical. It is true he wears a black suit, suitably picked out with white bands. In fact, some have thought, from his style in these matters, that he had a slight leaning toward Episcopacy; but then his clerical robes are sported with a cheery, brisk air of easy gayety, which, we are informed, has given at times great offence. Good Mrs. Jackdaw is hardly able to sleep nights on account of it; though she owns that he is the most eloquent of preachers; and Deacon Owl, though he can never praise Dr. Lincon's eloquence enough, is secretly of opinion that a touch of his own style of appearance would be a great addition to his usefulness.

But not one cloud is thrown over the bright mirror of our friend's mind by all this. Born of all joyous and happy elements, in some bright hour when Sorrow was asleep, and Faith and Love alone waking, he seems to have been dowered with only elastic and genial influences; and hence his theological lectures are bursts of combined music and poetry, which have a most thrilling and incomprehensible effect upon its auditory. Of book-learning he has little. His is a soul whose riches are from a marriage of the inner self with nature. He learns of stars, of brooks, of trees, of rustling shadows and wavering lights. In the morning, when the oak-leaves are hoary with dew, and the junipers and white-pines frosted with silver; when the long meadow-grasses bend as if in early worship, he is abroad studying his lectures. A thousand teachers, each more beautiful than the other, show unto him the "mysteries of the kingdom," which he presently unfolds in music.

Of his manner in lecturing, it is difficult to speak. With an easy, elastic grace of motion, as if he scarce belonged to this world, he pours forth in a perfect *abandon* rapid and sparkling jets of the most brilliant thought, baptized with devout sentiment as are meadow flowers with dew. A thousand vagrant and wayward changes, a thousand sweet capricious illustrations of fancy garnish his discourse. Dry dialectics he abhors; cold logic is not his *forte*. Would he prove the existence of a Creator, he does it not by lifeless reasoning, but by one such electric burst as enchants skepticism at once, and puts it entirely to rout. The truths which erst seemed as crystals of ice, in his ardent discourse seem to melt and rise in rainbows. Nor can he so nicely as some dissect theology from devotion, and contrive by severe analysis to freeze the heart while he informs the head. Ah! no. His lectures are hymns of praise, fired by faith, winged by love. How does he tell of the One Immortal Beauty! the divine, ever-present Love, in whom all things live, move, and have their being! How forcibly does he discuss the subject of particular Providence, extending to the minutest of his creatures! What electric warmth and light does he throw on the subject of faith! These are his favourite topics, and it must be said that his life illustrates them. He takes no thought for to-morrow. He fears nothing. He embarrasses himself no whit with the question what shall he eat, and what shall he drink. At its appointed moment faithfully he fulfills each appointed duty, without needless inquiries, delays, doubts, or forebodings.

On all the controverted positions of our day, the peculiar simplicity and purity of his faith has enabled him to give his decisions with singular correctness. With what scorn did he reject at once the idea of any lower law! One should have seen how at once he soared above all the sophistries of blinded politicians. One should have heard his eloquent declamations in favour of that universal law of liberty which all nature teaches. Never have I heard a more impassioned exhibition of the wickedness of Slavery than he gave in the fields of Andover, the memorable Sabbath after the black-week in Boston. He took for his text, "Thus saith the Lord, Break every yoke;" and such a cataract of declamation as he poured forth will not soon be forgotten. Choosing for his rostrum the most distinguished point of a meadow, back of the Seminary (he is fond of field-preaching), he poured forth a sermon which, could Commissioner Loring have heard, must have smitten him to the heart.

There is no bitterness in his energy. A divine spirit of love pervades his enthusiasm; but the slave-commissioner and slave-catcher, could they once thoroughly understand one of his discourses, would wither before its power; but alas! the whole race are of those of whom it is written "having ears they hear not." To understand his lessons, there must be something within to answer, and he who could sell his brother for money is blind and deaf. Beauty and music live for him in vain!

Ah! beautiful theologian! poet! orator! teacher! half angel! sweet messenger of God's love! *could* we learn of thee—thy life of undoubting faith—thy airy, buoyant cheerfulness—thy harmony with nature—thy prompt obedience to every law of thy being—thy fearless trust in Almighty Love, it were better for us!—HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, *in the Independent.*

NATURAL THEOLOGY.—TO H. B. S.

Dear Sister: Your communication, in reference to the theological opinions of Rev. R. Lincon, D. D., has lain much on my mind.

Yesterday, being somewhat at leisure, I thought I would call on some of the theologians of Newark Bay. My first essay was to ascertain the whereabouts of Rev. Thomas Codd, D. D., who is well-known to be a thorough representative of New England theology. To my regret, however, I found that he had declined the call to settle in these parts. I regret to say that the divines of Newark Bay and vicinity are rather *scaly*, in all their schools, and very apt to turn tail on the first approach of any ticklish subject. Some of them are decidedly of the stick-in-the-mud description, as, for instance, Rev. Greymalkin Catfish, D. D., who is always *pouting*, and Rev. Lamper Eels. There is this, however, to Eels' credit, that he is decidedly opposed to kicking up a bobbery, and is of a retiring disposition. Some people do say he is a slimy fellow, and that you never know where to find him. When you think you have him committed, he slips out and is not there. Nothing of this kind can be said against Rev. Strypid Bass, and Dr. Salmon Trout; for, although they are both so conservative, and afraid of committing themselves, that it is almost impossible to interest them, yet when they do take hold of a thing, they go with a rush, and make all snap again.

Porgie, however, is more progressive. You know Porgie, John Porgie? Or, I believe, his name is Sand, middle name perhaps, John Sand Porgie, settled down by Sandy Hook; and exchanges, now and then, with old Pollock of Bergen.

This Porgie is a greedy fellow, and though I never knew him take anything to drink, he is always ready for a bite of something. Fact, I never meet him anywhere about home but that he has something in his mouth, chewing. I believe he's mostly fond of clams. Fact, I shouldn't wonder if he took for his motto "De profundis *clam avi.*"

These excellent brethren are all staunch Old-Schoolers; and have never been suspected of Pelagianism, or Arminianism, unless it is that they lean a little to the itinerant system, like the Methodists.

I must do them justice to say, also, that they are all consistent cold-water men, and go their death for tee-totalism. Just look at Crabbe, Rev. Crinkle S. Crabbe, of Sandy-Bottom parish, I don't believe he ever took a horn in his life. Crabbe's weakness lies in a fondness for mutton. The boys can toll him to dinner with a sheep's head any day. Rather unbecoming in a pastor. Does he think the shepherd must eat the very heads off his sheep? Yet I have known him frequently get into a very critical position, really entangled in a net, as it were, if not actually flat on his back, from this singular muttonizing propensity. The only French phrase I ever knew him to succeed in pronouncing correctly was "Revenons à nos moutons."

There's a deacon in Crabbe's church named Bullfrog (Timothy Bullfrog, Esq.) He studied for the ministry, but did not take a license on account of an affection of his windpipe. A very estimable man is Bullfrog, though rather apt to look on the dark side of things; in short, a regular croaker, but he says that when his country's flag is in danger (O sweet-flag) he'll die in the last ditch rather than surrender.

Perch, that used to be settled here, died of worms that a boy gave him. I suppose he thought them vermicelli, but they injured his digestion, and brought on an acute inflammation of the mucous membrane, which soon raised him to a higher sphere. His name is celebrated from pole to pole.

So also is Roach. A brimming spirit was he. He was never fond of hanging on or dangling about in suspense when anything was going on. I believe it was bronchitis, or some affection of the gills, that did for him. He was always rather short and plethoric, much like Chubb. You knew Chubb? Roach would have got well enough, but for a little speculation in the shrimp line. How he got hooked, I never knew. But they all said it was bronchitis. You know they always do.

There was some talk of giving Mr. Simeon Shadd a call to settle in Bellville Creek; but they found that he was rather a tide-waiter, and changed their minds. They carped at him a great deal.

The poet Pickerel lives not far from here at a place they call Long Pond. I think of giving him a call next week. Pickerel is something of a critic in his way, and apt to be severe, not to say savage. Troll me none of your lines without even feet—says he. None of your doggrels and ballads for me. Frogg always had a sneaking taste for songs, you know, and Pickerel is forever snapping him up every chance he can get. If he baits poor Frogg in this way much longer, he'll get snapped up himself one of these days.

Did not you use to know little Polly Wogg, that lived down under Aunt Bull's bridge in Litchfield? Well, you cannot think how surprised I was to meet her the other day. She is just as natural as life—says she's engaged to Frogg. Can it be that Frogg would stoop to little Polly? Well, well, it is a good thing for her, the little velvety puss; she'll change her condition to some purpose. Quite a metamorphosis, as one may say.

I fear I have not conveyed a very prepossessing impression of the clerical order of the Bay. Perhaps I have done them scant justice. Possibly they would request me to tell you to inform your reverend clients of the grove not to *crow* over them.

No doubt your reverend friends know how to feather their nests. Do they not dun their parishioners for salary? Are they not always singing the same tune all about that little *bill?* And as to their ability, are they not always preaching over their people's heads? Is it not shrewdly suspected that not one in ten of their audiences understands half what they say? True, nobody can question the entire soundness of Rev. Oliver Owl, D. D., and the well-known Dr. T. Buzzard, and a few more of that feather. But are there not too many others that are always sky-larking round? Are not some of them, even, given to mocking? And does not Scripture speak solemnly against mockers?

Does not all the world know how conceited are Rev. Mr. Magpie, Rev. Mr. Jackdaw, and Dea. J. A. Jay?

And as to the anti-republican tendencies of Mr. King-fisher, to say nothing of the pro-slavery leanings of Revs. Kite, Hawk, Eagle, Vulture, and too many more of that kidney, my worthy brethren of the Bay feel it scarcely necessary to speak. It is well-known that their names were not among the 3050 signers of the remonstrance against the Nebraska Bill.

And as they are undoubtedly hovering over the very verge of total apostacy, and as birds of a feather flock together, let me tell you, dear sister, plainly that there is great apprehension felt in this vicinity for the soundness of Old Massachusetts. And that you must rely on more sterling characters than even your favourite Dr. Bob Lincon to restore fully the public confidence.

I gathered many of these sentiments during my row down the Bay yesterday, some fifteen miles and back, which, if it did not elevate the conceptions of the brethren above named, was certainly no fault of mine. I take no exceptions to their course, however. If they cannot rise to the level of my ideas, I am sure I cannot get down to theirs without considerable difficulty. Misapprehensions are frequent. There is apt to be something too pointed about any modes of expression let fall under such circumstances, at which suspicious and sensitive dispositions may take umbrage. I do not blame them. If they should apprehend my line of induction, and I should even succeed in elevating them to my level, I doubt if they would feel at home. I am afraid they would flounce about, and be as restless, and uneasy as ——— anything. So I say to them, let the world wag. Swim with the current. Take it easy. Keep cool. You go your way, I will go mine. If I ever have anything to communicate, I'll drop a line by post. Or if you have anything to say to me, there's Dr. Finney, of Oberlin, or my friend Fish of the Baptist Church, that ought to be able to put it right for you.

Hoping soon to hear more from you on matters and things in general, I am your affectionate brother.

GREY.

Independent.—[Presumed to be from Rev. CHARLES BEECHER, of Newark.]

MR. JOSEPH BARKER ON THE UNITED STATES.

From the Newcastle (England) Guardian.

On Wednesday evening, Mr. JOSEPH BARKER, on a visit to this country from the United States, delivered a lecture in the Music Hall, Nelson street, in this town, on "America, its climate, soil, and productiveness; it government, institutions, laws; its reforms and reformers; the character, manner, and customs of its people; botanical and zoological curiosities; prospects for emigrants," &c. The hall was crowded on the occasion in every part; and this being his first appearance in this town since his settlement in America, the lecturer on entering the hall was received with loud cheers.

Mr. Barker commenced by observing that it would be far easier to deliver ten lectures on America than one, and when he cast his eye over the vast extent of the subject before him, he felt somewhat embarrassed as to how to begin and how to proceed. He would, however, do the best he could; he would bring the lecture to as speedy a close as possible, and if he omitted some subjects on which parties present required information, he would, after the lecture, answer any questions and give to every one that information he most desired [applause]. He was not there to praise America, and of course not to abuse it, but simply to give such information as had come in his way during his sojourn there, and so make suggestions to those who were seeking reforms in their own country, and labouring for the improvement and happiness of their race. He purposely abstained from dwelling on those matters commonly found in books on the subject—it was not necessary that he should describe the scenery presented by different portions of the country, when the emigrant first cast his eyes upon them, nor yet that he should dwell on the large cities, as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, &c. He should take them chiefly to the interior, and speak to them of what he himself had seen, communicate that information which seemed to be most important to persons in their position. The bill had announced that he should speak of the soil and climate of America. Its soil, of course, was infinitely various; in some parts rich, in others poor; in some parts very deep, and in others very shallow. The greater part of the country, however, was capable of yielding abundant crops of everything necessary to the comfort and welfare of man. Its climate—where he himself was settled, in Ohio—was not only salubrious, but agreeable. He preferred it to the climate of his native land. It was colder in Winter and warmer in Summer. Sometimes in the Winter the cold was extreme, but that happened only seldom; in the Summer the heat was oppressive at times—perhaps for six, eight or ten days it might be so; but in general, both in Winter and Summer, the weather was agreeable, as well as perfectly healthy. The first year they went they had a very cold season. They expected such a season, and, indeed, severer cold than they experienced. One Friday evening, after a very beautiful week, the wind blew strong from the west. Through the night the thermometer fell very rapidly, soon got 20 or 30 deg. below freezing point, went down to zero at length, and in course of time 22 deg. or 24 below zero. The blankets felt very light he assured them, though they had a good stock of them. In the morning he attempted to shave, but the razor stuck to his fingers' ends, and the cold was such that he thought it would perform the operation without the razor's assistance [laughter]. His whiskers got stiff—a drop of water having touched them—and he was in a terrible fix before he had done. Some boiled water was spilled; a cloth was brought to dry it up, but cloth and water all became frozen together, and the water could not be wiped up. Next came preparations for breakfast; but everything was frozen, and the bread had to be cut with a hatchet. They found, however, that the oldest residents had not experienced such cold for twenty or thirty years. It should also be taken into consideration that they were then living in a log-house, having some fifty holes to let the cold in, and perhaps a hundred to let it out [laughter]. They had therefore the cold to perfection. This continued for 2 1-4 or 3 days, immediately after which they had tolerable weather. Their two succeeding Winters were mild. The days in Winter were two or three hours longer than here, and they were much brighter than our days—the sunlight of one Summer day there was equal to four or five times that of Summer days such as he had seen here during the last month. When the snow was on the ground, sledge travelling came into fashion. Every man had his own horse and conveyance, and if he had not a sledge he went into the woods and cut down the requisite timber and made one. They travelled in this way eight, ten, or twelve miles an hour, visiting their friends. Travelling in the night was not common, and most families were furnished with two or three beds extra, and many with four or five for the accommodation of their friends. The Winter, therefore, was generally a gay and happy time. It was a general holiday; many kinds of farm work could not be done, and young men, after working in the Summer, went to school in the Winter. Every place had its common school, and every county a superior school or college. The young people never thought shame to go to school, and they went to school till they were 20, 30, or even 40 years of age. When it rained in America, *it rained*—it poured—and generally kept at it 36 or 40 hours and then gets done [laughter]. They then calculate with certainty on fine weather. There was no uncertainty as to harvest weather. After rain they confidently expected three, four, six or eight fair days. One day dried their grass, made it into hay, and fitted it for the barn. As to the soil, in many cases the same kind of crop could be raised eighteen, twenty, or thirty years in succession. In bottom lands, near the river, it was two, three, five or six feet in depth, and on the uplands also this was frequently the case. Indian corn—an exhausting crop—was raised so many years without manure. This practice impoverished the land, and after having occupied it in this way ten or twenty years, the old settlers went to new and virgin soil further west, which they obtained for five, three, or one-and-a-quarter dollars an acre; whilst they sold their old farms, with its partially exhausted soil to new comers for ten or fifteen dollars an acre. New comers frequently did better with those partially exhausted farms than they could with new lands, on which the labour to them was strange and oppressive.

With respect to the government of the country, it was to a great extent democratic—not purely so, nor yet equally so in all the States. The Southern States, formerly nearly one half, were oligarchical, the slaveholders forming an oligarchy and ruling those States; and by a grevious misfortune, as a punishment it might be said for the Compromise which the Northern Free States had made with the Slave States, the Southern States had also a majority and were the ruling party as far as the Federal General Government was concerned. But every State in the Union was independent. Ohio had its own House of Commons, its own Senate, and its own Government, which made its own laws, except in a few particulars. In towns and counties also there was a great amount of self-government, and indeed there was little except local government in the country, and the people to a great extent ruled themselves. In the Free States there was something like universal suffrage, except that new commers must wait five years before they could be citizens, and the coloured people in some of the Free States had to possess a property qualification. The representatives were in proportion to the population—there were none of the anomalous inequalities observable in the electoral system of this country. The parliaments were biennial. The general Government was in the hands of the people; they elected the representatives, and indirectly they elected the President also; but the North so foolishly fancied that they were dependent on the South that numbers of the Northern men had become pro-slavery and played into the hands of the Slave oligarchy. The latter could always calculate on a moderate number of votes from the North, and by that means the Federal Government was rendered practically a Slave Government. But the North was now every day becoming more anti-slavery; the Abolitionists were increasing in influence; the Free Soilers, who simply said slavery should not be extended to any new parts of the Union, were also becoming more numerous, and many who formerly only said slavery should not be extended, now began to say, "slavery shall be abolished" [loud applause]. In a popular Government like this every man was important, and no man therefore despised another man or treated him with disrespect. The two great parties of the country were the Whigs and the Democrats—the latter, names being so often contrary, the least anti-slavery of the two. There was a minority, however, belonging to neither of these parties; and where parties were nearly balanced, that minority, if unitedly they refused to vote for any except those who would go for complete abolition, would extort a pledge from one or the other of the great parties to support abolition, and hence—a majority not being absolutely necessary to it—the abolition of slavery after all might not be so difficult a matter. It was exceedingly important that this country should aid the Abolitionists and the Free Soilers by public meetings and otherwise, as every such demonstration strengthened them and struck terror into the hearts of the pro-slavery men. Whilst behind all other countries with regard to slavery, however, the United States were ahead of other countries in many things. He had not the slightest doubt of the superiority of a popular Government over a class Government. The American Government was more economical than ours. The President had a salary of 25,000 dollars, whilst our Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and many of our sinecurists had five or ten times as much with nothing to do. He (Mr. B.) had a farm of 100 acres, a good house, a large orchard, twenty or thirty head of cattle, nine horses, and carts and carriages in proportion, and his taxes were not more than £8 a year. In consideration of these taxes, too, if he had ten children under twenty-one years of age they could all be educated out of the taxes [applause]. Improvements in roads and canals were also frequently helped out of the taxes. As to their laws, they were also superior in many respects to ours. They had no law of entail or primogeniture, no hereditary aristocracy, no state church, no church rates, no Easter dues. If a man died without a will, the eldest son did not inherit all—the younger children and daughters came in for an equal share, and the wife came in at any rate for a third of the property. A man could not sell his farm without his wife's signature; care was taken that she did so of her own free will, too, and not from intimidation or compulsion, so that his wife had him fast [applause and laughter]. It was true he might sell two-thirds without such consent, but his wife must have the third with the house upon it. Women were also favoured and protected by other laws and customs of the country, which he specified; and he particularly mentioned that, without any legal process, they could organize to suppress nuisances, and he mentioned one instance in New Lisbon where, in consequence of a young man having fallen down drunk and killed himself, the women organized and put down every gin-shop in the place [applause].

At another place, in Indiana, they also organized, a man having died of delerium tremens from drinking, and forced every inn-keeper to sign a pledge speedily to give up the business. The study of languages was common among the ladies, and many were good geometricians and mathematicians. Some of the medical colleges were open to females, and they had female Doctors of Divinity, Law, and Medicine. The fees of the lawyers were small; there were no needless formalities in the courts, and no counsellors with gowns. All were men—nothing more, and seldom anything less [applause]. When the Judge was done with his business, he talked with the farmer, and had nothing particular about him to distinguish him from the farmer, or from any other citizen. A whole transfer for 500 acres of land did not cost more than 6s. 3d., or 8s. 4d. at farthest. Education in the Free States was furnished to all; there were no taxes on knowledge, and he did not know of any place of 600 inhabitants without a newspaper. The town of 2,500 population, near which he resided, had three newspapers when he left, and, within a month of his return, would probably have four. Newspapers were an article of universal consumption; every working-man took one or more; their price was from one penny to three-pence; the postage was free in the towns in which they were published, and the postage on a paper carried 700 miles was only 5 cents or two-pence half-penny a quarter. If a million people left this year for America they would all find work in less than a month. Any number of young women could find good places in families, and obtain fair remuneration. Farm labour was paid worse; a farm labourer, however, had 13s. a week and board and lodgings. If he hired by the day he might generally have 3s. 1 1-2d. Shoemakers had 30s. to 35s. a week; mechanics had different wages according to circumstances, but all could get some kind of work at fair wages. Want was never known. There was abundance of fruit and vegetables—and, in fact, plenty of everything either for food or clothing or intellectual improvement. Provisions were nearly twice as cheap as here, though they were nearly twice as dear as they were five years since. Flour when he left was 2s. a stone. The people often lived too well. They take too much tea and coffee, and especially chew and smoke too much. Working men generally make themselves independent in eight or ten years—he did not mean that they would be relieved from labour altogether, but they could obtain 160 acres of land, a good house and stock, and then by means of moderate labour support themselves in comfort, and be dependent on no man [applause]. Hence he had never seen a wrinkle of care on the brow of an American. If a man failed in business it did not dishearten him; for he knew that if he fell he should rise again, and no man was allowed to be despised or trampled on. He had never seen a beggar but once, and that was an impostor from Canada; and he only knew one poor man, and he was so through indolence: for there as here if a man would not work the ground would not support him. The lecturer went on to give an interesting description of the vast and varied productions of the soil; its animals, birds, &c., and lastly, its troublesome insects and vermin. He spoke of the society found in the country, and of some of the religious sects. Speaking of American reforms and reformers, he noticed first the Anti-Slavery movement, at the head of which was WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, who had distinguished himself by boldness and prudence, by great courage and untiring industry, and though once a poor boy, had won himself a high position and had made himself respected and revered amongst the good, and feared and dreaded amongst the bad. He spoke of Garrison as holding similar sentiments to himself on the Scriptures, &c. Next he noticed the land reform, the object of which was that every working-man should have 160 acres of land granted to him, if he showed it was his *bona fide* intention to make it his home, by living upon it and cultivating it for five years. A bill to that effect was already under consideration, and had passed through one stage in the Legislature when he left the country. He spoke of certain experiments on the associative principle in the country having been successful; and he informed the audience how ready the neighbours were to assist each other, and especially new comers and the poor, in building their houses and in various farm operations, and how those meetings for work were afterwards succeeded by music, dancing and social enjoyment. He by no means, however, recommended indiscriminate emigration; it was a solemn experiment to change the Old World for the New, and parties ought to consider whether they were the proper parties to do so before they took the step. The lecturer concluded, stating his readiness to give any further information which he possessed [loud applause].

Some questions on the subject of the lecture were then answered, and the meeting separated.

An Italian proverb says, that "the smiles of beauty are the tears of the purse."

The Poet Campbell.—"It is well known," says Fraser, "that Campbell's own favourite poem was his 'Gertrude.' I once heard him say, 'I never like to see my name before the Pleasures of Hope; why, I cannot tell you, unless it was that, when young, I was always greeted among my friends as "Mr. Campbell, author of the Pleasures of Hope." "Good morning to you, Mr. Campbell, author of the Pleasures of Hope." When I got married, I was married as the author of the Pleasures of Hope; and when I became a father, my son was the son of the author of the Pleasures of Hope.' A kind of grim smile, ill subdued, we are afraid, stole over our features, when, standing beside the poet's grave, we read the inscription on his coffin: 'Thomas Campbell, L.L.D., author of the Pleasures of Hope, died June 15, 1844, aged 67.' The poet's dislike occurred to our memory: there was no getting the better of the thought."

THE CIRCASSIANS AMONG THEIR MOUNTAINS.

A correspondent of the [London] *Times* gives this interesting account of his visit to the valleys of the Caucasus, in company with Admiral Sir E. Lyons:

"A few miles beyond Golovinsky, says the writer, the Admiral stood close to the shore and anchored; the rest of the fleet did the same. Two Turkish trading boats from Trebizonde were high and dry on the beach, and hundreds of Circassians formed a picturesque crowd (nearly all being mounted) by the seashore. This point is named Bardan, and here the Russians have perseveringly tried to get a footing, and as often being foiled by Circassian rifles, the owners of which are not a little proud of the frequent repulsions of Moskov. Bardan has therefore been the only Circassian post, and from this place the young ladies have for years been eligibly settled in the harems of the great men of Stamboul. From this place Captain Brook and the engineer officer started over the mountains with a few Sappers and an escort of Circassians, commanded by Ismail Bey, to cross the Russian road by hook or by crook, and to communicate with Schamyl, if possible. As soon as we landed we were surrounded by a crowd of Circassians, who immediately led us by a path from the shore, through woods, brambles, and ditches, to a long field, surrounded by woods, among which several wooden dwellings showed their roofs. This was a beautiful spot, and the grass beneath us a mass of daisies and buttercups. A renewal of acquaintance with these was not the least pleasant part of our trip. A Circassian made me mount his horse. Crossing a stream, I gave it up again, and prepared, with a guide, to scale one of the mountain heights. We had a heavy pull up this hill, on a narrow pathway covered with briar and brambles. On our way we met two Circassian young ladies, rather moon-faced, but with beautiful complexions and pleasant expression. Our Circassian friend called to them to cover their faces (we had a dragoman with us)—an order which the young ladies showed their good sense by neglecting. At the top we had a most noble view, a complete panorama of rich wood, overtopped with snow; several villages were dotted among the woods and upon the mountain sides, the dwellings being all of wood. We descended by another mountain path to the sea; here we took another stroll, and entered a wood. We had been advised not to stray too far, as the Circassians of the mountains were ignorant of our arrival, and might take us for Russians. In the wood we met a fine-looking old gentleman, mounted, and proceeding slowly; with him were two Circassian girls, his daughters, as it appeared. Not knowing what to make of us, he drew his sword, or rather long knife, and looked fierce; but on nearing us, and seeing we were unarmed, returned it again, and was quite happy when he knew us to be 'Inghealeez.' Then his daughters came forward and shook hands with all. One was about twelve years old, the other fourteen, the latter exceedingly pretty